



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# Classical Philology

VOL. II

July, 1907

No. 3

## THE INTERRELATIONS OF THE GREEK DIALECTS

BY CARL DARLING BUCK

### I

The question of the interrelationship of the Greek dialects has an unceasing attraction, not only to the grammarian, but to every student of Greek history. For it always has held and will continue to hold the first place in any discussion of early Greek tribal relations. It is true that we have gone through a period of destructive criticism as to the validity of linguistic evidence, the nature and even the existence of well-defined dialects. But the total result of the discussions evoked by such criticism, and the more searching inquiry into the character of living dialects, especially those of France and Germany, has been only to emphasize more strongly the inseparable connection between language and political and economic history. I will not dwell here upon this general proposition, which I have emphasized elsewhere,<sup>1</sup> especially since in the study of the Greek dialects the propriety of combining linguistic and historical data has never been seriously doubted, and, in recent years has been maintained with renewed confidence.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>“The Relation of Comparative Grammar to Other Branches of Learning,” an address delivered at the St. Louis Congress of Arts and Sciences, September, 1904, and now printed in the proceedings of the same, Vol. III, pp. 32 ff. (see pp. 43 ff.). See also the recent literature cited in *Indog. Forsch. Anz.* XVIII, p. 46, note.

<sup>2</sup>For example, in the excellent articles of Solmsen, especially his “Thessaliotis und Pelasgiotis,” *Rhein. Mus.* LVIII (1903), pp. 598 ff.; Meister’s *Dorer und Achæer*, [CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY II, July, 1907]

But the traditional data concerning the early relations and movements of the Greek peoples are of such unequal value, such a mixture of genuine tradition and later fiction, and so incomplete withal, that it is essential to view the linguistic evidence as objectively as possible. A necessary preliminary to the impartial study of the dialect relations is, of course, the determination of the distribution of each linguistic phenomenon without regard to any preconceived notion of their grouping. Such studies as Thumb's *Spiritus Asper*, Kretschmer's "Der wandel von  $\tau$  vor  $\iota$  in  $\sigma$ ," *Kuhn's Zeitschr.* XXX, pp. 565 ff., Solmsen's "Der Übergang von  $\epsilon$  in  $\iota$  vor Vocalen," *Kuhn's Zeitschr.* XXXII, pp. 513 ff., and others, are fundamental. The next step is to observe how these phenomena group themselves. Agreement between dialects in certain phenomena, if not accidental, must be due to their contiguity at some period. It may reflect their position either in the historical period or in one or more prehistoric periods. The greater the number of phenomena in which dialects agree the less likelihood that this agreement is accidental. And if the agreement of certain dialects in a considerable number of phenomena coincides with traditional accounts of the relations of those speaking them, we are entitled to regard the latter as confirmed. Now, in order to realize all the possibilities of grouping and their relative cogency it is almost necessary that the distribution of the various phenomena should be presented in such a way as to be readily surveyed, namely, in tabular form.

For some years I have employed a series of charts of this kind for my own convenience and for purposes of instruction; and my chief excuse for adding another to the existing discussions of the dialect relations is the belief that such a tabular presentation is not a mere device for the assistance of beginners, but can claim scientific value as affording an objective view of the linguistic evidence which it is not easy to gain otherwise.

which must, however, be regarded as a failure in its main thesis (see below, p. 245), Thumb's "Dialektforschung und Stammesgeschichte," *Neue Jahrb.*, 1905, pp. 385 ff. The earlier monograph of Hoffmann, *De mixtis Graecae linguae dialectis*, though often manipulating the evidence in a wholly unconvincing manner, deserved more credit for its suggestiveness than it received from its critics.

But whereas in my original charts the phenomena were arranged in logical order (vowel changes, consonant changes, case-forms, etc.) without regard to grouping, I have preferred to present in this paper a chart of phenomena selected and rearranged so as to bring out the most significant groupings, leaving for a later time the exhibition of the other phenomena, the distribution of which does not fall into such groups, and is, for the most part, in my opinion, accidental. Naturally, however, the material given in this chart is not all of equally certain significance, and I have included some few things about which I am myself doubtful, but which it seemed most convenient to present here. On the other hand, I have excluded a number of phenomena to which some scholars have attributed a significance which I cannot find warranted in the actual distribution. For example, the infinitive in *-εν* is often classed as a Doric characteristic, while vice versa, Hoffmann, *De mixtis graecae linguae dialectis*, pp. 60 ff., claims it as an "Achaean" element which has survived in some Doric dialects. But the distribution of *-εν* and *-ειν*, *-ην* is not such as to lend any plausibility to either view, and has, I believe, no more bearing on the grouping of the dialects than that of the imperative endings *-ντω* and *-ντων*. Yet I recognize that no two scholars will agree in all details in their judgment of what is significant and what is accidental, and claim nothing final for the selection made.

The following points are to be noted in explanation of the chart. The distribution of a given phenomenon is shown by crosses placed in vertical columns beneath a caption indicating the phenomenon in question and opposite the names of the dialects in which this appears. The captions are of widely different scope; some referring only to the particular form given (e. g., *τοί*), others (e. g., *δίδωμι*) being examples chosen as a convenient means of briefly indicating a phenomenon of considerable range, the precise scope of which is stated, and material quoted where this seemed called for, in the notes, which are numbered to coincide with the columns of the chart. I had thought of distinguishing between cases where the absence of a cross is due to the fact that the form of a dialect is known to be different and where

it may be due simply to lack of evidence, but decided that to carry this out systematically would only obscure the chart, and that this matter was better left to the notes. But a cross within a circle ( $\oplus$ ) is sometimes used as an intimation of some reservation, the nature of which is explained in the notes, e. g., "late," "unusual," "indirectly evidenced," etc.

The dialects represented include all those which are at all adequately known. Omitted are Pamphylian, because of the meagerness of the material, and Achæan, Messenian, Cnidian (as well as those of many of the small islands of the Aegean), Aetolian, Acarnanian, Epirotan, of which we have little or no material which is not late and simply in the Doric or Northwest Greek *κοινή*. But anything of importance from these dialects is mentioned in the text. Thessalian is subdivided into that of the Pelasgiotis (P.) and that of the Thessaliotis (Th.), for which the terms East and West Thessalian, though not strictly appropriate, are sometimes used in the text for brevity. But the distinction is observed (a cross of reduced size opposite the subdivision is used) only where there is actual evidence that the two differed; that is, a phenomenon is cited simply as Thessalian (the cross then being of the usual size) not only when it is quotable from both, but also when it is quotable from only one division, provided there is no reason as yet to suspect that this is anything but accidental. Ionic is also subdivided into East (E.), Central (C.), and West (W.) or Euboean, though in this chart there is only one occasion to distinguish them. Phocian includes, and, as regards early material, consists mainly of, Delphian, and the forms cited are generally quoted as such. Megarian and Corinthian, of course, include the dialect of the colonies. Argolic is used as the general term for the dialect of Argolis, while Argive has its more specific sense, and forms from the cities of the Acte are generally cited as Epidaurian, etc. The dialects of Cos and Calymna are included under the head of Coan, those of Thera and Melos under Theran. West Greek is employed, as frequently in late years, as the general term to include the Northwest Greek dialects and the Doric, the latter term being used in its narrower and usual historical sense. Lesbian, Thessalian, and Boeotian

are, as usual, called Aeolic, though the last two are so only in part. For the group which is represented in the historical period by Arcadian and Cyprian I have generally been satisfied with Arcado-Cyprian, but one feels the need of a different term when referring to pre-Doric conditions (it is incongruous to speak of an Arcado-Cyprian survival in Argolis or Laconia), and I have been tempted to follow Solmsen in calling the group Achæan (Hoffmann's South Achæan). For I am convinced that this is the proper application of this much-abused term, and the only objection is that it is used by others in such widely different senses.<sup>1</sup>

The results of the chart are not to institute any radically new groupings, but mainly to confirm conclusions, some of which have long been evident, and others clear to many in recent years, but not so universally recognized as to make it superfluous to give them emphasis. The close connection between the Northwest Greek and the Doric dialects was surmised by Ahrens, who pointed out (I, p. 2) that the statement of Strabo (viii. 333) according to which they were Aeolic was unsupported by any other evidence, either traditional or linguistic. This conclusion has been fully confirmed by the additions to the material from the Northwest Greek dialects, at that time meager and mostly late, and has been made increasingly evident by the early Delphian inscriptions found in recent years. It is seen now that a fundamental division of the Greek dialects is that into the West Greek dialects as a whole and the East Greek, or, as Wilamowitz

<sup>1</sup> Ridgeway, *Early Age of Greece*, and R. Meister, *Dorer und Achæer*, apply the term Achæan to a population which was pre-Doric, but not identical with that whose speech survived in Arcado-Cyprian. But there is no adequate evidence of any such intermediate stratum. Meister's Achæan has all the features which characterize the West Greek dialects as a whole, and its alleged difference consists in the absence of certain peculiarities (not included in the present chart) which belong to some of the Doric dialects and, in part, some which are not Doric, but which Meister now stamps as the real criteria of pure Doric. The distinction between Doric and Achæan elements which he finds in the inscriptions of Laconia, Argolis, etc., resolves itself into a question of *κοινή* influence. This is the view which forced itself upon me in reading the book, and I wrote out a brief criticism along this line, especially as regards the treatment of intervocalic  $\sigma$ . But I am satisfied now to refer simply to the reviews of Fick *Woch. f. klass. Phil.*, 1905, cols. 593 ff., Thumb *Neue Jahrb.*, 1905, pp. 385 ff. and especially that of Schwyzler *Indog. Forsch.*, Anz. XVIII, pp. 46 ff., with which I am in full accord.

has aptly called them, the Old Hellenic dialects. Nevertheless our maps of ancient Greece are still under the ban of Strabo's statement, showing Phocis, Aetolia, etc., in Aeolic coloring, and one may still find Phocian, Aetolian, Acarnanian, etc., classed under the head of Aeolic, e. g., in such an excellent epigraphical work as Kern's *Inschriften von Magnesia*, p. 237. The chart shows at a glance the numerous peculiarities which characterize the West Greek dialects as a whole (also some that are more doubtful), as well as those which distinguish the Northwest Greek from the Doric proper. The mixed character of Boeotian and Thessalian, in striking confirmation of the tradition (Herod. viii. 176, Thuc. i. 12. 3), is made apparent; their Aeolic peculiarities appearing on the right, the West Greek on the left, the latter element being stronger in Boeotia than in Thessaly, and in Thessaly itself stronger in the Thessaliotis than in the Pelasgiotis, as already shown by Solmsen in the article cited above. When we come to the more difficult question of the relations of the East Greek dialects to each other, more especially the position of Arcado-Cyprian, which Hoffmann groups definitely with Aeolic under the head of North and South Achæan, while others claim as dogmatically that the two groups are "gründlich verschieden" (Cauer *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*, p. 152, note), the chart has the merit of presenting the evidence impartially. Arcado-Cyprian has notable points of agreement with the Aeolic which cannot be dismissed as insignificant, but also lacks many of the distinctive Aeolic peculiarities seen in Lesbian, Thessalian, and Boeotian; and on the other hand, it shows certain affinities with Attic-Ionic (partly Arcadian only). The historical interpretation of these relations will always be problematical, but it is most reasonable to assume that the affinities with Attic-Ionic reflect contiguity with Ionic peoples in the Peloponnesus both before and after the departure of the colonists of Cyprus, while the affinities with Aeolic reflect an earlier position, contiguous to Aeolic peoples and presumably to be sought in Northern Greece. Arcadian has some West Greek peculiarities which, we may safely assume, were introduced after the Doric invasion.

## INTERRELATIONS OF THE G

[illegible]



# REEK DIALECTS—CHART I

		40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	
		η from ā	χός	ήμης	έθηκεν	έθεσαν	εί	έν	Infinitive in -ου	ίη = έη	γεν. sg. αυ	πός = πρός	σίς = τής	κός = καί	δόν = έδε	dat. w. άπό, etc.	έμει, σάλλα, etc.	τα = μέτα	αντεvoc. ι > ε	καλλίσσαι	φειλέμεν	ρε = ρι	πέμπε	port. ppie in -ων	patr. adj. = gen. sg.	άγρέω = αλφείω	πόδες	δέcoros	όμ(όν) = άνά	άπό = άπό	φίληται	σπορός	πείδ	
Attic		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+																									
E. C. W. Ionic	E. C. W.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+																									
Arcadian							+	+	+	+	+	+	⊕	⊕	+	+											+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Cyprian									+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+													+	+	+	+		
Lesbian																	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
P. Thessalian Th.	P. Th.																+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+			
Boeotian																				+	+	⊕	+	+	+		+				+	+		
Phocian																											+							
Locrian																											⊕							
Elean																									+	⊕					⊕			
Laconian																																		
Heracleian																																	⊕	
Megarian																																		⊕
Corinthian																										⊕						⊕		
Argolic																																⊕	+	
Rhodian																																	⊕	
Coan																																	⊕	
Theran																																⊕	⊕	+
Cretan										⊕																					⊕	⊕	+	



## NOTES TO THE CHART

*Left. West Greek*

1-15. These are the phenomena which have the clearest claim to be regarded as general West Greek characteristics. Barring a few cases of actual divergence in Cretan (5, 7, and possibly 11), we are entitled to assume that the absence of examples in some of the dialects, which is especially noticeable in the case of Locrian, Elean, and Laconian (for which, however, Heracleian, which is given a separate place, fills out most of the blanks), is purely accidental, due to the insufficiency of the material. It must be remembered also that in many of the Doric dialects, even where the total amount of material is extensive, for example, Rhodian, only a very small part of it antedates the period of κοινή influence, most of it being in what may be called the Doric κοινή (really a Doric-Attic κοινή), in which certain of the West Greek characteristics, in distinction from others which persisted for some centuries, were given up. Thus the numerals appear in the κοινή form almost universally after the fourth century B. C.; *ἰαρός* is generally replaced by *ἱερός*, *τοί* very frequently by *οἱ*, and often the first plural ending *-μες* by *-μεν*.

Of these general West Greek characteristics, 1-10 are also common to Boeotian, 1, 2 (and presumably 3), 4-6 to Thessalian (5 only in the Thessaliotis), and 3-4 even to Arcadian.

1. *δίδωσι* = *δίδωσι*. This stands for a considerable class of words in which the retention of the original *τ* is a West Greek, its change to *σ* an East Greek, characteristic. In general, the assibilation of *τ* before *ι* is a change the precise conditions of which still remain obscure. Neither their formulation by Kretschmer (*Kuhn's Zeitschr.* XXX, pp. 565 ff.), nor that of Goidanich-Brugmann (Brugmann *Gr. Gram.*<sup>3</sup>, p. 66, and the literature cited) is convincing. And, whatever the true factors, they are in part wholly independent of dialectic variation. But there remains a considerable class of words in which there is a clean-cut dialectic distribution of the *τ*- and *σ*-forms, and, no matter whether this is strictly phonetic or due to opposite leveling in the two groups, it is one of the most significant of all dialectic variations.

1) All verb forms with the endings *-τι*, *-ντι*. Examples are plentiful in all the West Greek dialects and Boeotian, and they are replaced by the forms in *-σι* only in the most extreme stages of κοινή influence. That Thessalian belongs in the same group is shown by the 3 pl. subj. *κατοικεῖονθι* (Hoffmann II, No. 17; see Schulze *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1897, p. 881). The *θ* of this and the corresponding Boeotian forms (*-νθι* beside sing. in *-τι*) do not represent a phonetic change, an intermediate stage between *-ντι* and *-νσι*, as was once thought, but arose in the 3 pl. mid. (Thess. *ἐγείνονθο*, Boeot. *συνεβάλονθο*) under the influence of the endings *-μεθα*, *-σθε* (still otherwise Schulze in Sadée *De Boeot. tit. dial.*, p. 23). For the position of Thessalian, cf. also *πὸτ*, *Ποταειδοῦν*, cited below.

2) The numerals for 20 and the hundreds, (Ϝ)ίκατι = εἴκοσι, -κάσι = -κόσιοι (Arc. κάσιοι). See under 2 and 3.

3) Some nouns and adjectives in -τις, -τιος, -τια beside -σις, -σιος, -σια. The majority of words of this class show σ without dialectic variation, while a few have τ even in East Greek. For the material see especially Kretschmer *loc. cit.* There are plenty of σ-forms in the West Greek dialects, many of them much too early to be attributed to κοινή influence, and, in view of their frequency and the uncertainty as to the factors involved in the change, it would be rash, in my opinion, to stamp them as survivals from the pre-Doric period, as Solmsen, *Rhein. Mus.* LIX, p. 492, note, though expressing himself cautiously, seems inclined to do. Nevertheless there are a number of words which do show a variation between τ and σ and in which the prevalence of the τ-forms in the West Greek dialects is unmistakable. The most important examples are: Ἀρταμίτιος, Ἀρτεμίτιος in numerous Doric dialects beside a few late forms with σ. See Kretschmer *loc. cit.*, p. 583. Cf. now also Delph. Ἀρταμίτια = Ἀρτεμίσια (SGDI. 2561 D. 8).—Boeot. Ἀφροδίτιος, Ἀφροδιτία, but oftener Ἀφροδίσιος, Ἀφροδισία, all examples being late (see IG. VII, Index, Sadée *De Boeot. tit. dial.*, pp. 36 f.), Epid. Ἀφροδίτιον (IG. IV. 1497), Lac. Ἀφροδοτία (name of a town, Ahrens II, p. 61). Ἀφροδίτιον occurs beside Ἀρτεμιτίω in a late inscription of Acrae, a colony of Syracuse (SGDI. 3246), and Ἀφροδισίων Ἀρτεμισιών in an inscription of the Magnetes, which is of the first century A. D. and wholly in the κοινή (*Ath. Mitth.* VII, pp. 71 f.).—πλούτιος, πλατίος, ἐνιαύτιος = πλούσιος, πηλσίος, ἐνιαύσιος are cited as Laconian in the *Etym. Mag.* (Ahrens, II, p. 60), and of these πλατίον occurs also in literary Doric (Ahrens, *loc. cit.*), and ἐνιαύτιος in inscriptions of Cos (SGDI. 3636. 37) and Delphi (*ibid.* 2501. 44). But ἐνιαύσιος in Telos (*ibid.* 3458), κατενιαύσιος at Gela (*ibid.* 4250).—Ethnica in -ούντιοι, -οντιοι, -ώντιοι (all from -ο(Ϝ)έντιοι), like Σελινόντιοι, Ὀπούντιοι, Ὀπόντιοι, Σκελλώντιοι, etc. (see Kretschmer *loc. cit.*, p. 582) are frequent in West Greek territory. Naturally these forms are commonly retained in all dialects, e. g., by Attic writers, but there is evidence of by-forms with σ which may be claimed as the true East Greek equivalents, e. g., Σελινόσιοι, Ὀποείσιοι (Ahrens II, p. 61).—The inhabitants of the Ionic Μίλητος are known as Μιλήσιοι, and this form is generally retained, at most with the substitution of ā for η, e. g., Boeot. Μιλάσιος (IG. VII. 519) beside usual Μιλήσιος. But the inhabitants of the Cretan Μίλατος were known as Μιλάτιοι (SGDI. 4952 D. 17, 5152).—Ahrens II, p. 62 thinks that γεροντία which occurs in Xen. *Rep. Lac.* x. 1. 3 in the sense of 'membership in the senate,' was the true name of the Spartan senate. But γερωχία Aristoph. *Lys.* 980 is certainly intended to represent a Laconian γερωχία (from \*γερωσία).—The name of the Boeotian town which appears in Homer in its old Aeolic form Εὔτηρσις (cf. also Εὔτηρσις in Arcadia), shows its later Boeotian form in Εὔτηρετί-φαντος (see Sadée *De Boeot. tit. dial.*, p. 36, Solmsen *Rhein.*

*Mus.* LIX, p. 494), and now more directly in *Εὐτρητιδιεῖς Ἀπόλλωνι BCH. XXVIII* (1904), p. 430.—*ῥντιάζω* = *ῥνσιάζω* is evidenced by Troiz. *ἐρρυ-τασμένους*, etc., *IG. IV. 752 passim*.<sup>1</sup>

4) For *πρός* Homer has also *προτί* and *ποτί*, but otherwise the distribution of the *τ* and *σ* forms is precisely the same as in *δίδωσι*, *δίδωσι*, namely *πορτί* in Cretan, *ποτί* in all the other West Greek dialects, including Boeotian and Thessalian, but Att.-Ion., Lesb. *πρός*, Arc.-Cypr. *πός*. Argol., Locr., Delph. *ποί*, beside *ποτί*, has, among other explanations, been viewed as coming from a pre-Doric \**ποσί* (Arc.-Cypr. *πός*), like Lac. *Ποιοιδάν* beside Arc. *Ποσοιδάν* (see below). So, most recently, Thumb *Neue Jahrb.* 1905, p. 396. I believe that this is correct, and that it is not accidental that the form is most frequent in Argolis, where the change of intervocalic *σ* to *h* and its eventual loss is well attested. But the presence of the form in Delphian and Locrian is still a puzzle to me. Thumb assumes that not only the *σ*, but its change to *h*, is pre-Doric, and that this change occurred not only in the Peloponnesus but in Northern Greece. But apart from the difficulty of assuming this even for the Peloponnesus (in view of *σ* in Arcadian), the earlier population of Locris and Phocis was doubtless Aeolic, and there is no trace of such a treatment of *σ* in any Aeolic dialect.

5) In the name of the god Poseidon the *τ*-forms (*Ποσειδάων* etc.) are attested for various Doric dialects and for Delphian, Boeotian, and Thessalian, the *σ*-forms for Attic-Ionic, Lesbian, and Arcadian. See Solmsen *Rhein. Mus.* LVIII (1903), pp. 619 ff. The Lac. *Ποιοιδάν* has long been recognized as the pre-Doric (Achaean) form (cf. Arc. *Ποσοιδάν*) with the regular Laconian change of *σ* to *h*. There are several occurrences of *Ποσειδάν* in Doric inscriptions, which Solmsen thinks may also in part represent a retention of the pre-Doric form. In principle there is, of course, nothing to be said against this. But the inscriptions containing them are nearly all of a time when *κοινή* influence is to be looked for, and the few which are of any extent show other evidences of this, e. g., two from Calauria (*IG. IV. 840, 841*) which have *τριακοσίας* and *εἰ* for earlier *αι*. The only early examples are from Rhodes, and may be ascribed to the early Ionic influence which is evident in the Doric islands of the Aegean.

6) The change of *τ* to *σ* before *ν* is, like that before *ι*, hard to define precisely (see Lagercranz *Zur griech. Lautgeschichte*, pp. 121 ff., and Brugmann *Ber. sächs. ges. Wiss.* 1901, pp. 89 ff.), and only in part subject to dialectic variation. But where such variation exists the parallelism with *δίδωσι*, *δίδωσι* is too marked to be accidental. Att.-Ion., Lesb., Arc. *σύ* (Arc. *σύ* in *Philologus* LIX (1900), p. 201), but Dor. *τύ* (literary Doric,

<sup>1</sup> I pass over *Μυρtilος* which Schulze *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1897, p. 892, and Solmsen *Rhein. Mus.* LVIII (1903), p. 616, regard as distinctively West Greek, as contrasted with Lesb. *Μυρτίλος*. But *Μυρtilος* is also a good Athenian name. Cf. Thuc. v. 19 and 24, *IG. II. 977 d. 10*.

confirmed by an inscription of Epidaurus, *SGDI.* 3342. 63), Boeot. *τού* (Corinna). The existence of *τύ* beside *σύ* in Lesbian is properly doubted by Meister I, pp. 122 f. The form is of course rare in inscriptions and most dialects offer no examples.—Att.-Ion. *ῥμισυς*, *ῥμίσεια*, *ῥμισυν*, Lesb. *αἰμισέων*, Arc. *ῥμισυν*, but Cret. [ῥ]μιν-έκτῳ *SGDI.* 4957, Epid. *ῥμίτεια IG.* IV. 914. There are, indeed, more examples of forms in *-συν* in West Greek territory, cited by Brugmann *loc. cit.*, and more fully by Gunnerson *History of u-Stems in Greek*, pp. 51 ff., who points out the possibility that they are due to *κοινή* influence. As a matter of fact all the examples quoted are from inscriptions which are either wholly in the *κοινή* or show plenty of *κοινή* influence. Coan *ῥμισυν SGDI.* 3636, 51, overlooked by Gunnerson, is somewhat earlier, but even this inscription, though purer than any others from Cos, already has the Attic forms of the numerals, as *εἰκάς* beside *ικάς*, acc. pl. *τρεις*, *χλιαστίς*.—Delph. *Δάπυς*, Phthiot. *Δατίας*, Dolop. *Δατυιάδας*, but Boeot. *Δασύας*, all belonging with Att. *δασύς*, *Δασυμένης*. See Brugmann, *loc. cit.*, p. 93.

2. (*ϛ*)*ίκατι* = *εἴκοσι*. This form is characterized not only by its retention of *τ*, for which it has already been cited under 1, but also by *ι* and *α* of the first and second syllables, in contrast to Att.-Ion., Lesb., Arc. *εἴκοσι* (also doubtless Cyp., though no example is quotable), which has *εἰ* from *ἐ-ϛι* with prothetic *ε*, and *ο* for *α* after the analogy of the following numerals in *-κοντα*. *ρίκατι* or *ῖκατι* (also Pamph. *φίκατι*) is directly attested in most of the West Greek dialects and Boeotian, and in some of the others (where  $\oplus$  appears in the chart) is implied, at least as regards the vowel of the first syllable, by *ικάς*, which sometimes survives after *ῖκατι* itself has been displaced by *εἴκοσι*, e. g., in the Rhodian and Coan inscriptions. See Solmsen *Untersuch. zu gr. Laut- und Verslehre*, pp. 252 ff. and V, *Rhein. Mus.* LVIII (1903), pp. 614 ff.

The same relation exists in the ordinal *ῥικαστός*, quotable only from Boeotian, = Att.-Ion. *εἰκοστός*, Lesb. *εἰκοστός* (see *Class. Rev.* XIX, pp. 242 ff.).

3. *τριακάτιοι*, Arc. *τριακάσιοι* = *τριακόσιοι*. The numerals for the hundreds, which have already been cited under 1, show also a vowel variation similar to that of *ρίκατι*, *εἴκοσι*. But their distribution differs from that of the preceding in that in this respect Arcadian goes with the West Greek dialects. Examples of *-κατιοι* occur in Cretan *SGDI.* 4985, 5014, 5100, Theran (Cyrene) *ibid.* 4833. 15, 52, Coan *ibid.* 3705. 12, Arg. (Mycenae) *ibid.* 3316, Epid. *IG.* IV. 1488 *passim*, 1492. 11, 31, Troiz. *SGDI.* 3362. 48, 51, Heracl. (26 times, twice *-κοσιοι*), Lac. *SGDI.* 4413. 16, 4427, 4598 *a.* 1, *b.* 2 (Xuthias inscr.), Elean *ibid.* 1154, 1156, Delph. *ibid.* 2501. 29, *BCH.* XXVI (1902), pp. 41 ff. (frequent), *ibid.* XXVII (1903), pp. 21 ff. In the other West Greek dialects examples of these numerals are lacking or occur only in later inscriptions after the introduction of the *κοινή* form. *-κατιοι* is also Boeotian, e. g., *SGDI.* 488. 118, 489. 38,

etc., and it is safe to assume that it is Thessalian, too, though not yet quotable.

4.  $\epsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\epsilon\alpha = \epsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\sigma\alpha$ . Isolated examples of the extension of the  $\xi$ , which is regular in the future and aorist of verbs in  $-\zeta\omega$  coming from guttural stems, to the corresponding tenses of other verbs in  $-\zeta\omega$ , are found even in Homer ( $\pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\mu\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu$ , as vice versa  $\eta\rho\pi\alpha\sigma\epsilon$  beside  $\eta\rho\pi\alpha\epsilon$ ) and Hesiod ( $\phi\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega\sigma\iota$ ). But this does not impair the significance of the fact that this becomes the normal type in the West Greek dialects, together with Thessalian and Arcadian. Examples are numerous in nearly all the West Greek dialects, and the type remains one of their most persistent characteristics, surviving in some of the very latest inscriptions which have any claim to be dialectic (e. g.,  $\acute{\alpha}\phi\eta\rho\acute{\omega}\iota\zeta\epsilon\nu$  in Thera, as late as the third century A. D.<sup>1</sup>). Hence it is quotable even from dialects which, on account of the lateness of the material, are not included in the chart, as Messenian (Andania inscr.), Achaeae, Epirotan, and the N. W. Greek  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\eta$  (see Kern *Insc. von Magnesia*, p. 240). In Locrian the place of a verbal example may be supplied by  $\psi\acute{\alpha}\phi\acute{\iota}\xi\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  (see below). The Heracleean Tables contain  $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma\acute{\omega}\iota\sigma\alpha\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  (once  $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma\acute{\omega}\iota\zeta\alpha\mu\epsilon\varsigma$ ) beside  $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha\zeta\alpha\nu$ ,  $\epsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\zeta\alpha\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha\acute{\zeta}\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ , etc. ( $\xi$  in twelve different forms, many of them occurring several times), and, in view of  $\sigma\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\iota$  in Sophron, Coan  $\delta\acute{\iota}\epsilon\sigma\omega\iota\sigma\epsilon$  *SGDI*. 3618. 15, and Achaeae  $\sigma\omicron\nu\delta\iota\alpha\sigma\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\iota\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  *ibid.* 1612. 10, this is probably not due to  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\eta$  influence, but to contamination with  $\acute{\zeta}\omega\sigma\alpha$  (Hom.  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\acute{\alpha}\omega\sigma\alpha$ ) from  $\sigma\acute{\omega}\omega$  ( $\sigma\alpha\acute{\omega}\omega$ ), not  $\sigma\omega\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ .

But in Argolis there is a noteworthy restriction of the type, the  $\xi$  formation being avoided when a guttural precedes. Cf. Arg.  $\epsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$  etc. *SGDI*. 3273, 3277 (also from the Heraeum *IG*. IV. 521),  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$ ,  $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$  *BCH*. XXVII (1903), pp. 270 ff., Troiz.  $\phi\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha\sigma(\sigma)\alpha\tau\omicron$  *IG*. IV. 801 (cf. also  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$  beside  $\delta[\mu\alpha]\lambda\acute{\iota}\zeta\iota\omicron\varsigma$  *SGDI*. 3362), Epid.  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  *SGDI*. 3325,  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\sigma\chi\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\alpha\iota$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\sigma\chi\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$  etc., *ibid.* 3339, 3340, beside  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\rho\mu\acute{\omicron}\zeta\alpha\iota$ ,  $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\pi\tau\acute{\rho}\acute{\iota}\zeta\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  *ibid.* 3339, 3340,  $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\zeta\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  *IG*. 1508. Epid.  $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\zeta\alpha\varsigma$ ,  $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\zeta\alpha\iota\tau\omicron$  *IG*. IV. 941 (ii cent. B. C.) are to be attributed to the influence of the Doric  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\eta$ , likewise  $\sigma\tau\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\zeta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , *ibid.* 1485. 286, beside  $\sigma\tau\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$  in l. 60 (written earlier). In most other dialects there is no such restriction (Cret.  $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon\iota$ , etc.), but cf. Calymn.  $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\sigma\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  beside  $\psi\alpha\phi\acute{\iota}\zeta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$  *SGDI*. 3591 (but also  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\alpha\iota$  *ibid.* 3569), and with Epid.  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\sigma\chi\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\alpha\iota$  compare  $\sigma\chi\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\epsilon$  in Pindar.

Boeotian has several forms in  $\xi$ , as  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\alpha\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\zeta\epsilon$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon$ ,  $\acute{\iota}\alpha\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\zeta\alpha\sigma\alpha$ , but oftener forms in  $\tau\tau$  (= Att.  $\sigma$ ) as  $\kappa\omicron\mu\iota\tau\acute{\tau}\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ ,  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\eta$ ,  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\alpha\sigma\theta\eta$ , etc. For full citations, see Sadée *De Boeot. tit. dial.*, pp. 20, 26. The variation seems to be local, yet there is little continuity in the geographical distribution of the forms (examples of  $\xi$  from Coronea, Leuctra, Thespieae, and the temple of Ptoon Apollo near Acraephiae; of  $\tau\tau$  from Tanagra, Thebes, Lebadia, Orchomenus, and the boundary between Copae and Acraephiae).

<sup>1</sup> On  $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\acute{\omega}\nu\alpha\zeta\alpha$  etc. in Modern Greek, see Hatzidakis *Einleitung*, pp. 135 ff.

Thessalian and Arcadian had uniformly ξ, so far as we can judge from the few examples, e. g., Thess. ψαφίζασθαι, ψαφίζαμένος, ἐργάετο, Arc. παρετάξωνσι, παρηταξαμένος. Cypr. ἐξορύξῃ would be an example, if from ἐξορίζω, but this I regard as most improbable.

The further extension of the guttural stem to other forms of the verb is mainly confined to the Sicilian and Italiot writers, as ἄρροκται, Pythag.; μελικτάς Theocr.; etc. See Kühner-Blass I, p. 158. But beside Heracl. κλαίγω (ποτικλαίγων, ποτίκλαιγον II. 69. 107) we find κλαικτός at Andania and Argos (*BCH.* XXVII (1903), p. 271), and κλαίξ, as in Theocr., also at Andania and Epidaurus (*SGDI.* 3325. 110 etc.). More widespread are the abstracts in -ξίς = -σις, as Locr. ψάφιξις, Coreyr. χείρις *SGDI.* 3206. 61; Cret. ἀπολάγαξις, χρημάτις *ibid.* 5010, Mess. ἀγόραξις *ibid.* 4680. 22, Epid. ὁμάλις, στέγαξις (see above), Delph. ὁμάλις *BCH.* XXIII (1899), p. 566, Lac. καθίππαξις (Hesych.), Syrac. κατονόμαξις (Archim.). Cf. also Cret. ψάφμιμα from \*ψαφγιμα, Solmsen, *Rhein. Mus.* LVI (1901), p. 506. A predilection for guttural stems is also to be recognized in the case of some other nouns. Thus, besides κλαίξ already mentioned, we have Lac. κέλξ = κέλῃς *SGDI.* 4416, and ὄρνιξ, Gen. ὄρνιχος = ὄρνις, ὄρνιθος in Pindar, Theocritus, etc. (ὄρνιξ also in *Papyri Brit. Mus.*, pp. 173, 175, etc.), Delph. Ὀρνιχίδας *SGDI.* 2502. 452, 2768, although the usual dental stem appears in Cretan (ὄρνιθα). I would bring into this same connection the fact observed by Solmsen *Rhein. Mus.* LIX (1904), p. 502, that the proper names Φαῖκος, Φαικίας etc. are West Greek.<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, at the risk of making too much of something that is possibly only accidental, and without claiming that my material is complete, I would call attention here to the relative frequency of hypocoristic proper names in -αξ, -ακος, and -ακων in West Greek. Of names in -ακος I find in Kirchner's *Prosopographia Attica* only Ἰππακος, which is also Ionic (Callim. ep. xii), Φύλακος also Ionic (Fick-Bechtel *Griech. Personennamen*, p. 312), Βύττακος, which is a Macedonian name (see Kirchner *op. cit.* no. 2933), and Ἀ[σ]τακος, who is not an Athenian by birth. Δρίμακος and Σίμακος occur in *IG.* II. 1012. i. 14, but this is a list of metics. Δρίμακος the leader of the slaves in Chios (*Athen.* 6. 265 e) was, of course, not a native Chian. Πόρρακος occurs in Paros (*IG.* XII. v. i. 173. iii. 1) and Tenos (*SGDI.* 5492. 77; cf. also *IG.* II. 983. iii 131), Μάλακος in Andros (*IG.* XII. v. i. 717). Δόνακος is Lesbian (*IG.* XII. ii. 74) likewise Πίττακος the famous lawgiver of Mytilene. But in West Greek dialects, including Boeotian and Thessalian, we find, aside from the legendary Theban heroes Ἄστακος and Λάβδακος (the latter name also in Sicily, see Pape), Ἀρακος at Sparta (Pape), Δρώπακος in Aetolia, *SGDI.* 2520, 2522, Pthiotis, *ibid.* 1439 (also the name of a metic at Delos,

<sup>1</sup> The preference for a guttural termination in Magna Graecia and Sicily may help to explain Lat. *Alāx* = *Atlas*, which Jordan *Krit. Beiträge*, p. 37, has already connected with names like *Phalaξ*.



Ditt. *Syll.*<sup>2</sup> 629. 13), Μάρακος at Syracuse (Pape), Πύστακος of Daulis, *SGDI*. 1969. 22, Σίμακος from Epirus, *IG*. IV. 1504 I. 26, 1508. B. 6, Daulis *SGDI*. 1969, Cephallenia, Kern *Insc. von Magnesia* 35. 34, Argos, *SGDI*. 2563. 36, 2564. 68, 2567. 70, Στρόφακος of Pharsalus (Thuc. iv. 78) whence also Στροφάκειος *SGDI*. 326. 89, Σώτακος of Delphi, *SGDI*. 1786, and Cephallenia, *ibid.* 2530, Φλόφακος a Boeotian, Έφ. Άρχ. 1896, p. 243.

Hypocoristics in -άκων are most frequent in Laconian, the lists of Spartan officials, *CIG*. 1237 ff., containing Δεινάκων, Εὔδαιμάκων, Ξενάκων, Πασάκων, Τειμάκων, Φιλάκων (cf. also Δαρακίων). Σιμάκων is Boeotian, *IG*. VII. 1380 (likewise the feminine Σιμακώ, *ibid.* 2682), but occurs also in Samos, *BCH*. V. 482. 9, 11. Φιλακώ is Coan, *SGDI*. 3593. 31, but also Parian, *ibid.* 5437. 7. Ἡράκων, which is found in many dialects (Attic, Aetol., Boeot., Delph., Meg., Rhod.) is a different case, being the hypocoristic in -ων to Ἡράκλειτος.

The great majority of names in -αξ are simply appellatives used as proper names (Fick-Bechtel, pp. 304 ff.), such as Ἄρπαξ, Δόναξ, Θώραξ, Κόραξ, Ἱέραξ, Σκύλαξ, Στύραξ, Χάραξ, etc., and these are not dialectically significant. But there are also some with a hypocoristic suffix -αξ as Corinth. Γύλαξ (Pape), Boeot. Πύρραξ (Thisbe *IG*. VII. 2724 b), Τρίαξ (Thebes, Thespieae, Tanagra, see *IG*. VII, Index, and Fick-Bechtel, p. 297), probably also Σίλλαξ name of a Sicilian (*IG*. IV. 1504 II. 33) and of a painter of Rhegium (Athen. 5. 210 α), Epid. Στίαξ (*IG*. IV. 1485. 116, 118), Delph. Φλείαξ (*SGDI*. 2562).

5. τοί=οί. Although τοί, ταί are still found in Homer beside the more frequent οί, αἱ, formed after the analogy of the singular, the latter (or οἶ, αἶ) are the only forms known in the inscriptions of Attic, Ionic, Lesbian, and Arcado-Cyprian. But in all the West Greek dialects except Cretan, and in Boeotian, we find uniformly τοί, ταί in the earlier inscriptions, and where οί, αἱ appear beside them, as frequently in the Doric and Northwest Greek κοινή, they are clearly due to the influence of the Attic κοινή. The one exception among the West Greek dialects is Cretan,<sup>1</sup> which has οἶ, αἶ from the earliest times, e. g., always in the Law Code. Thessalian has οἶ in the Pelasgiotis, e. g., κοῖ=καὶ οἶ in a fifth-century inscription of Larissa (Kern *Insc. Thess. Ant. Syll.* No. XVIII), but τοί in the Thessaliotis, as attested by an inscription of Pharsalus from the transitional period of the alphabet (*Mon. Antichi* VIII, p. 66). See Solmsen, *Rhein. Mus.* LX (1905), pp. 148 ff.

6. ἱαρός=ἱερός. In the West Greek dialects and Boeotian, ἱαρός or ἱαρός is always the earlier form, while ἱερός is later and plainly due to

<sup>1</sup> By Cretan is meant, here and elsewhere, central Cretan. How far the divergencies from it which are to be observed in the east of the island represent a genuine local variation, and how far they are due merely to external influence, need not be discussed. But there is no doubt that the τοί which appears in a third-century inscription of Itanus (*SGDI*. 5058) is one of the importations from the Doric κοινή of the other Doric islands.

*κοινή* influence. The position of Thessalian is uncertain. We find *ιαρον-  
τοῖς* in an inscription of Crannon, otherwise *ἱερός* (citations in Hoffmann  
II, p. 272), but all late. It is possible that Thessalian had both the East  
and West Greek forms, though in this case it is not at Crannon that we  
should expect to find the latter. On the other hand, the situation may  
be precisely the same as in the dialects before mentioned. For all the  
examples of *ἱερός* are from a time when in these dialects also *ιαρός* had  
been replaced by the *κοινή* *ἱερός*. This latter view is the one which I  
believe will prove to be correct, when we have early occurrences of the  
word in Thessalian. An apparent example of *ιαρός* in Arcadian is to be  
seen in a dedication coming from the temple of Artemis at Lusi (*SGDI*.  
1601 = *Wiener Jahresheft* IV (1901), pp. 83, 84, No. 17), but it is doubtful  
if the dedicator was an Arcadian. For other and earlier dedications  
from the same place have *ἱερός* (*ibid.* Nos. 14, 16), and this is always the  
form in other parts of Arcadia, examples occurring in the earliest inscrip-  
tions of Tegea (Hoffmann I, No. 29) and Mantinea (Fougères *Mantinée*,  
pp. 523 ff.). The form with *ε* is also Cyprian (*ἱερεὺς*, etc.), as well as  
Attic-Ionic (Ion. also *ἱρός*, *ἱρός*, like Lesb. *ἱρος*).

7. \**Αρταμς* = \**Αρτεμς*. Since the collection of examples given by the  
writer *Am. Jour. Phil.* (1889), pp. 463 ff., Boisacq *Les dial dor.*, pp. 33 ff.,  
G. Meyer *Gr. Gram.*<sup>3</sup>, pp. 102 ff., the material has been considerably  
augmented. There can be no question now that \**Αρταμς* was the form  
of all Doric dialects except Cretan, and of Delphian and Boeotian, and  
that \**Αρτεμς*, which is also frequent in several of these, is due to *κοινή*  
influence. Wherever the word occurs in early inscriptions the form is  
always \**Αρταμς*. Thus, to quote only some of these early examples,  
Delph. \**Αρταμς*, \**Αρταμίτια* in *SGDI*. 2501, 2561 (early iv cent.), while  
later inscriptions have uniformly \**Αρτεμς*. Lac. \**Αρτάμ* *SGDI*. 4559  
(early v cent.), agreeing with \**Αρταμ*, \**Αρταμπίω* of Aristoph. *Lys.* 1251,  
1262, while all other inscriptional occurrences are late and in the *ε*-form.  
Epid. \**Αρτάμυτι* *IG*. IV. 914 (about 400 B. C.), Corinth. (Pthius) \**Αρτάμ[ιτος]*  
*IG*. IV. 440 (v cent.), Theran \**Αρτάμυτι*, \**Αρταμπίω* *IG*. XII. iii. 452, 1326  
(iv cent.). In the other Doric dialects, where both forms occur, the  
examples are all late. In Boeotian, \**Αρταμς* remains the usual form as  
long as the dialect survives at all.

The only Doric dialect which has \**Αρτεμς* from the earliest times,  
and, so far as we know, the only West Greek dialect (in Locrian or Elean  
examples are lacking) is Cretan. We find \**Αρτεμς* in the Law Code  
(iii. 6, 7), as well as in later inscriptions. \**Αρταμπίων* in one of the Teian  
decrees is of no value as evidence. Thessalian, like Attic-Ionic and  
Lesbian, has \**Αρτεμς*, the earliest example being Hoffmann II, p. ix, No.  
4 a, probably of the fourth century. In Arcadian we find \**Αρταμς* in the  
two oldest of the dedications from the temple at Lusi (*Wiener Jahresheft*  
IV (1901), p. 83, Nos. 14, 15), while others somewhat later have \**Αρτεμς*

(*ibid.*, Nos. 16–18), which also occurs in an early inscription from Cotilum, Ἐφ. Ἀρχ. 1903, pp. 177 ff., likewise Ἀρτεμισίοι in an inscription of Stymphalus (Hoffmann I, No. 24). In Cyprian there are no examples.

8.  $\kappa\alpha = \kappa\epsilon$  ( $\check{\alpha}\nu$ ). This is the form of all the West Greek dialects and Boeotian, and remains one of their most persistent characteristics. Thessalian has  $\kappa\epsilon$ , like Lesbian, Cyprian (Arc.  $\kappa'$  in  $\epsilon\iota \kappa'$ , also, without doubt, for  $\kappa\epsilon$ ). The use of  $\check{\alpha}\nu$ , in contrast to both  $\kappa\alpha$  and  $\kappa\epsilon$ , is referred to elsewhere (46, among the specific characteristics of Attic-Ionian and Arcadian.—The same  $\kappa\alpha$  appears also in  $\delta\kappa\alpha$ ,  $\tau\acute{o}\kappa\alpha$ ,  $\pi\acute{o}\kappa\alpha$ , etc. =  $\delta\tau\epsilon$ ,  $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ ,  $\pi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ . Such forms are attested for Laconian, Cretan, Rhodian, Elean, Delphian, as well as literary Doric, and are to be assumed without question for all the West Greek dialects and Boeotian. The forms with  $-\tau\epsilon$  are Attic-Ionic, Arcadian (for examples, lacking until recently, see now Fougères *Mantinée*, pp. 523 ff., and *Philol.* XLIX (1900), pp. 201 ff.), and Cyprian. But Lesbian has  $\delta\tau\alpha$ . Thessalian examples are lacking.  $-\kappa\alpha$  is used even in Attic in  $\eta\acute{\nu}\kappa\alpha$ ,  $\tau\eta\acute{\nu}\kappa\alpha$ , etc.— $\gamma\acute{\alpha} = \gamma\epsilon$  is attested for Argolic (*IG.* IV. 506), Elean, Delphian, Boeotian, as well as in literary Doric, and is to be assumed for all dialects which had  $\kappa\alpha = \kappa\epsilon$ .—Adverbs in  $-\theta\alpha = -\theta\epsilon\nu$ ,  $-\theta\epsilon$ , as  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\theta\alpha = \pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu$ , occur in Cretan ( $\pi\rho\acute{o}\theta\theta\alpha$ ), Delphian ( $\pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\tau\alpha$ ), and Heracleian ( $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\theta\alpha$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\rho\sigma\theta\alpha$ ), but cf. Meg.  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\theta\epsilon$  in an early inscription of Selinus *SGDI.* 3045 B, Argol.  $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\rho\sigma\theta\epsilon$ ,  $\acute{\omicron}\pi\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon$ ,  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\theta\epsilon$  *SGDI.* 3362 (Troizene), etc. They are also cited as Aeolic by the grammarians and occur in Alcaeus and Sappho, but the inscriptions have only  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\theta\epsilon$ . See Hoffmann II, p. 274. In a few adverbs, as  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta\alpha$ ,  $-\theta\alpha$  is even Attic-Ionic.

9.  $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma = \pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ . This is attested for all the West Greek dialects except Locrian and Elean, in which no examples occur, and is also Boeotian.  $\pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\varsigma$  is Attic-Ionic, Lesbian, Thessalian ( $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ), Cyprian (quotable only in proper names), and doubtless Arcadian, though not yet quotable.

Both forms have been almost universally regarded as the products of contraction from either  $*\pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $*\pi\rho\acute{o}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , or  $*\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ . The point raised by Eulenberg (*Indog. Forsch.* XV, p. 142, that there is no trace anywhere of an uncontracted form, is, in my opinion, a sufficient objection to either of the assumed forms with  $\rho$ , in spite of Brugmann *Kurze vergl. Gram.* III, pp. xxi ff. It is less cogent against  $*\pi\rho\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , but this also involves the assumption that the regular contraction of  $\omicron\alpha$  in Doric is  $\bar{\alpha}$ . And, while this is the accepted doctrine at present and is not doubted by Eulenberg, I can see no way of reconciling it with the evidence of other forms, which points rather to a contraction of  $\omicron\alpha$  to  $\omega$  in all dialects. Schulze *Quaest. epic.*, p. 532, while deriving  $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$  from  $*\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , confessed himself at a loss to account for the existence in Doric dialects of names in  $-\acute{\omega}\nu\alpha\acute{\varsigma}$  from  $-\omicron\phi\alpha\nu\alpha\acute{\varsigma}$ . To be sure, Eulenberg *loc. cit.*, p. 139, asserts: "Die zahlreichen Eigennamen wie  $\Delta\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu\alpha\acute{\varsigma}$ ,  $\text{Ἰ}\pi\pi\acute{\omega}\nu\alpha\acute{\varsigma}$ ,  $\Pi\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\alpha\acute{\varsigma}$  aus  $*\omicron\phi\alpha\nu\alpha\acute{\varsigma}$  sind sämtlich ion. (dor. dafür  $\text{Τιμ}\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\acute{\varsigma}$ )," and

Brugmann *Gr. Gram.*<sup>3</sup>, p. 62, cites "dor. Τιμᾶναξ aus \*Τιμό-αναξ." This would give a distribution of the forms parallel with that of *πρῶτος, πρώτος*, but unfortunately is not in accord with the facts. Τιμᾶναξ is Rhodian and is from Τιμᾶ-, like Τιμᾶκράτης, while the same dialect has Δαμῶναξ, Δαμῶνασσα from Δαμο- beside Δαμόκρατης, etc. (see Index to *IG. XII. i*). In Thera we find Τιμῶναξ (very frequent), Τιμῶνασσα, Δαμῶνασσα. Many of the examples are late, and might be attributed to *κοινή* influence, but we find nothing different in earlier times, Τιμῶνασ(σ)α occurring in the archaic inscription *IG. XII. iii. 804*. Τιμῶναξ *SGDI. 5151* was born at Amphissa, though his father came from Cyprus and was the son of a Cretan father and Cyprian mother. Δαμῶνασσα is also Delphian, *SGDI. 2106*, Ἐρμῶναξ Megarian, *ibid. 3014*, and Argive, *ibid. 2566. 61*.

Aside from these names in -ῶναξ, note also Heracl. μέιω from \*μείο(σ)α, and further the crasis of ο, ὄ(ον), ω + α in West Greek, as Corinth. τῶγα-θόν = τὸ ἀγαθόν *SGDI. 3209*, Meg. ὄρχεδαμε = ὦ Ἀρχεδαμε *ibid. 3044*, Ach. ὄρταμος = ὁ ἄρταμος *ibid. 1653*, Corinth. τῶπελ(λ)όνι = τῶι Ἀπέλλονι *ibid. 3227*, Boeot. τὸπόλλωνι = τοῖ Ἀπόλλωνι *IG. VII. 2732*, Delph. τῶπόλλωνι, τῶπελλαίον = τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι, τοῦ Ἀπελλαίου *SGDI. 2561 D 44, 46*. This is the usual result seen in inscriptions, as always in literary Doric (see Kühner-Blass I, p. 224), and must represent the normal contraction, while the other type of crasis, that seen in Att. ἀνῆρ, is rare, e. g., Corinth. τάριστερόν = τὸ ἀριστερόν *SGDI. 3163*, Arg. τάργειοι = τοῖ Ἀργεῖοι *ibid. 3263, 3264*, τάργειῶ = τοῦ Ἀργείου *ibid. 3271*.

10. ὅπει = ὅπον. Adverbs of 'place where' in -ει = Att.-Ion. -ον. Cret. ὅπει *SGDI. 5148*, πει (αἶ πει = εἰ πον) *ibid. 4952 C. 40*, αὐτεῖ (Hesych.), Ther. τεῖδε *ibid. 4788*, Coan ὅπει *ibid. 3715. 63*, Anaphe ὅπει, αὐτεῖ *ibid. 3430*, Rhod. ὅπει *ibid. 3749. 100*, Meg. ὅπειοῦν, ἄλλει *ibid. 3052*, Corcyr. εἰ *ibid. 3196, 3199*, ὅπει *ibid. 3200, 3203*, τουτεῖ *ibid. 3220*, Epid. αὐτεῖ *ibid. 3342. 68* (poem of Isyllus), οὐθαμεῖ *ibid. 3340. 22*, Delph. εἰ (frequent), ὅπει *SGDI. 1728*, ἄλλει *ibid. 1830*, τηνεῖ *ibid. 2561 C. 37*, μηδαμεῖ *ibid. 2561 C. 34*, χαμεῖ *ibid. 2561 D. 48*, Boeot. αὐτῖ = αὐτεῖ *Rev. ét. gr. XII (1899), p. 71 A. 5*. Here also, by analogy, Heracl. ποτεχεῖ = προσεχῶς, and Delph. ἐπεχεῖ *SGDI. 2642. 47*. For examples in literary Doric (e. g., τηνεῖ, etc. in Theocritus), see Ahrens II, pp. 361 ff.

It may be safely assumed that this type of adverbs was common to all the West Greek dialects, with Boeotian. On the other hand forms like ὅπον are found only in Attic-Ionic. Neither type is as yet quotable from Lesbian, Thessalian, or Arcado-Cyprian.

11. φέρομες = φέρομεν. Since the appearance of examples in Delphian it is safe to reckon the ending -μες as one of the West Greek characteristics, although first plural forms are still lacking in Elean and Locrian. In many dialects it was replaced by the Attic -μεν at a comparatively early period, e. g., at Delphi -μεν beside -μες before the end of the fourth

century, later nearly always *-μεν*. Hence it happens that in Rhodes and some of the other islands from which all the examples are late we find only *-μεν*. But the only Doric dialect about which there is any reason to be in doubt as to whether *-μες* was the proper form is Cretan. The only examples of it are *εὐχαριστῶμες* *SGDI*. 4940 (Allaria), and *δμωμόκαμες* *ibid.* 4952 (Dreros), both inscriptions being late and not in the genuine (central) Cretan dialect. Most of the examples of *-μεν* are also late, but *SGDI*. 5100, in which *ἔλοιμεν* occurs, is substantially pure in dialect. Hence, until we have further material, we must recognize the possibility that Cretan was exceptional in this respect (cf. *οἱ* = West Greek *τοί*, 5).

From other dialects, which are only partially represented in previous collections, may be quoted: Ther. *ἐμβαλοῦμες* *SGDI*. 4706. 278, Calymn. *εὐρίσκομες*, *ἐννίκαμες* *ibid.* 3591 *b.* 14, 21, Arg. *ὑπογεγράφαμες* Kern *Insc. v. Magnesia* 40. 7, Epid. *ἀπεδώκαμες* *IG*. IV. 1488 (very frequent), 1490-92, *ἐξ[ε]δω[κα]μες* *ibid.* 1485. 162, *παρεδώκαμες* *ibid.* 1488. 12, 14, *ἐπωφέλομες* *ibid.* 1485. 171, 172, Corinth. *ἴφομες* *IG*. IV. 324, Meg. *νικόμες* *SGDI*. 3046 (Selinus), *ἴκομες*, *διαπεινάμες* Aristoph. *Ach.* 750, 751, Heracl. *εὐρίσκομες*, *ἐστάσαμες*, etc. (very frequent, never *-μεν*), Lac. *ἴκομες*, etc., Aristoph. *Lys. Mess.* *ὁμολογήσαμες* *SGDI*. 4645. 16, Delph. *ἀπεδώκαμες* *ibid.* 25(2. 2, 2503. 13, 16, *ποτεθήκαμες* *ibid.* 2502. 55, *ἐδώκαμες* *BCH*. XXVI (1902), p. 7, *ὑπογεγράφαμες* *ibid.* XXX (1906), p. 273 (No. 49). *-μες* also in Epicharmus, Sophron, and Theocritus. *-μεν* is Attic-Ionic, Arcadian (cf. *ἐδικάσαμεν* in the early Mantinean inscription, Fougères *Mantinee*, pp. 523 ff.) Lesbian, and Thessalian (*ἐπινωείσομεν* *SGDI*. 345. 13), and presumably Cyprian though not quotable. The position of Boeotian in this respect is uncertain so long as the only example is *ἐπράθομεν* Corinna 16.

12. *δειξέω* = *δείξω*. Although a few words show this type in Attic-Ionic, the "Doric future" is regular only in the West Greek dialects. Of the examples, too numerous to be worth quoting here in full (for extensive, but not complete, collections, see G. Meyer *Gr. Gram.*<sup>3</sup>, pp. 619 f., Boisacq *Les dialectes doriens*, pp. 193 ff.), cf. Cret. *βοαθησῶ* (with *ι* from *ε*) *SGDI*. 5014, *πραξίομεν* *ibid.* 5176. 15, *βοαθησίοντι* *ibid.* 5024 B. 84, *τεισῇται*, *πραξῇται* *ibid.* 4998 I. 7, VI. 6, Ther. *θησέοντι* *IG*. XII. iii. 452, *πραξοῦντι* *SGDI*. 4706. 248 (with Attic *ου*, as often), Rhod. *ἐπιμεληθησεύντι*, *ἀποδωσεινται* *ibid.* 4118. 6, 7, Coan *ποιησεῖται* *ibid.* 3619. 7, *ἐχθυσεινται* *ibid.* 3634 *b.* 27, Cnid. *ποιηρεῖται* *ibid.* 3505. 21, Epid. *βλανέσθαι* *ibid.* 3339. 75, *ἐσσεῖσθαι* *ibid.* 3340. 84, Calaur, *ποιησοῦντι* *IG*. IV. 841, Corcyr. *ἐκδανεισοῦντας*, *χειριεῖντας* *SGDI*. 3206. 9, 44, Meg. *ἀντεθησεῖται* *ibid.* 3052, Heracl. *ἐγδικαξῇται*, *ἐργαξῇται*, Cephall. *συνθυσοῦντι*, *συναυξησοῦντι* Kern *Insc. von Magnesia* 35. 25, Ithaca *ὑποδεξοῦμενον* *ibid.* 36. 2, Delph. *πραξέω*, *ὀρκιξέω* *SGDI*. 2501. 5, 13, *ἀποδειξέω*, *βλάψέω*, *ταγενσέω*, etc. 2561 A. 1 ff. Examples of the future happen to be lacking in Laconian, Elean, and Locrian. In Heracleian the third plural forms *ἐξοντι*, *κοψοντι*, *ἐργαζονται*, etc. are now generally regarded as belonging to the ordinary future type and accord-

ingly accented *ζῶντι*, etc. For from the *-σεω* type one expects *-σιοντι* like *ἀναγγελῶντι*, etc. See Solmsen *Kuhn's Zeitschr.* XXXII, pp. 545 ff. But in no other West Greek dialect is there evidence of the co-existence of the two types, ordinary future forms occurring only in late inscriptions and evidently due to *κοινή* influence.

13. *τέτορες* = *τέσσαρες*. Examples in Cretan *SGDI.* 4964, Coan *ibid.* 3638, 3639, Calymn. *ibid.* 3591. 19, Epid. *IG.* IV. 1485. 166, 1488 *passim*, Meg. (Chalcedon) *SGDI.* 3052, Heracl. (12 times, once *τέσσαρες*), Locr. *ibid.* 1479, Delph. *ibid.* 1683, 2502 *passim*, 2562. 2, 15, 48, *BCH.* XXVI (1902), pp. 7 ff. (very frequent), *ibid.* XXVII (1903), pp. 21 ff. In the other West Greek dialects examples of the numeral are either lacking (e. g., Elean, Laconian) or occur only in later inscriptions when *τέτορες* has been replaced by the *κοινή* form, as it was in most of the dialects mentioned after the fourth century.

14. *τετρώκοντα* = *τεσσαράκοντα*. So Heracl. *τετρώκοντα* (4 times, once *τεσσαράκοντα*), Corc. [τε]τρώκοντα *IG.* IX. i. 880, Delph. *τετρώκοντα* *SGDI.* 2502, 2562, and *BCH.* XXVI, pp. 8, 41, 54 (all fourth century; later *τεσσαράκοντα* or *τετταράκοντα*). In most of West Greek dialects there are either no occurrences of this numeral (e. g., in Laconian, Cretan, Locrian, Elean), or only from the period of *κοινή* influence, as Coan *τεσσαράκοντα* *SGDI.* 3632 (II cent.). A fourth-century inscription of Troizene, *IG.* IV. 823, has *τεταράκοντα*, clearly due to Attic influence, beside *διακάτιοι* etc., and a somewhat later inscription from Epidaurus, *IG.* IV. 1492, has *τεσσαράκοντα* beside *πεντακάτιοι* (but also *ἑξκοσι*). There is no occasion to doubt that *τετρώκοντα* was common to all the West Greek dialects. Archimedes has always *τετρωκοστός*, though only *τεσσαράκοντα* and *τέσσαρες*. See Heiberg *Index*. *τετρώκοντα* is often quoted as "Doric and Ionic" (G. Meyer, Brugmann), and *τετρωκοστός* actually occurs in an Ionic inscription of Mylasa, of 361/0 B. C., *SGDI.* 5753 b. But other Ionic inscriptions and Herodotus have only *τεσσεράκοντα* or *τεσσαράκοντα* (Hoffmann III, pp. 248 ff.), and this *τετρωκοστός* I believe to be a survival from the Doric period which we are entitled to assume for Mylasa and other Carian cities, as well as for Halicarnassus. Cf. Müller *Dorer* I, p. 107: "Vielleicht hat auch Mylasa einige Verbindung mit den Doriern."

15. *αἱ τίς κα*. This peculiarity in word-order has been noted as Doric by Ahrens II, p. 383, Wackernagel, *Indog. Forsch.* I, p. 369, and Schulze, quoted by Dittenberger *IG.* IX. i. 695. Wackernagel *loc. cit.* quotes examples from Crete, Heraclea, Mycene, Corcyra, and from a Doric *κοινή* inscription from Arcadian Orchomenos. Others might be added from Rhodes, Thera, Cos, Calymna, etc. For even in late inscriptions which show much *κοινή* influence, this remains the more usual order, e. g., *εἰ τίς κα* in late Rhodian inscriptions, as *SGDI.* 3836, or in the Theran will of Epicteta, *ibid.* 4706. The same order holds in Delphian not only in the earlier period, e. g., *αἱ δέ τίς κα*, *αἱ δέ τίς κα* *SGDI.* 2561 A. 28, B. 51, but in

the later manumission decrees, where such phrases as *εἰ δέ τις κα ἐπάπτηται*, *εἰ δέ τί κα πάθῃ* are very frequent. This is also the usual order in Aetolian decrees, e. g., *SGDI*. 1410, 1411, 1413. Hence, though examples are lacking in Locrian and Elean, there is no reason to doubt that this order is common to the West Greek dialects as a whole.

But Boeotian and Thessalian, so far as I have observed, go with the East Greek dialects in this matter; Boeot. *ἡ δέ κά τις ἐπάπτεται* *SGDI*. 497 ff., *ἡ δέ κά τις . . . καθιστάει* *ibid.* 802. 9, Thess. *αἱ (μ)ά κέ κῖς κατασπάσει* Hoffmann II. 7. 27, *αἱ κε τῶν φασσῶν κῖς φαλίσσκέτα[ι]* *ibid.* 5 (both from Phalanna; whether the same holds for the Thessalitis remains to be seen). Cf. Lesb. *αἱ κέ τις*, *αἱ δέ κέ τι* Hoffmann II. 83. 2. 37, Arc. *εἴ κ' ἄν τι*, *εἰ δ' ἄν τις*, *id.* I. 30 *passim*, Cypr. *ἡ κέ σῖς* *ibid.* 135. 10. 24.

16-25. These phenomena are West Greek in the sense that they are found only among West Greek dialects, and they are often cited among the Doric characteristics. Some few of them, I am fully convinced, were common to all the West Greek dialects, though quotable from only a very few, and there are some others for which this is a possibility. On the other hand, many of them are distinctly limited in scope.

16. *ἐμίν* = *ἐμοί*. The datives *ἐμίν*, *τίν*, *ῖν* are frequent in literary Doric and often quoted as Doric by the grammarians. See Ahrens II, pp. 251 ff. *εἰν* is also quoted as Boeotian, and *τείν* occurs in Homer. From inscriptions we have Cret. *φῖν αὐτοῖ* Law Code II. 40, *ἐμίν αὐτῶι*, *SGDI*. 5147 b. 11, Calymn. *ἐμίν*, *ibid.* 3591. 8, Delph. *ἐμίνγα*, *ibid.* 2501. 7. But the enclitic forms ended in *-οι* in West Greek, as elsewhere. Thus Cret. *φοι*, *SGDI*. 4998. 5, Arg. *φοι*, *IG*. IV. 506 (Heraeum; vi cent.), Delph. *μοι*, *φοι* *SGDI*. 2561 A. 16, D. 14 besides later occurrences like Epid. *οἱ* frequent in *SGDI*. 3339, Cret. *μοι* *SGDI*. 4952 b. 34. Nothing stands in the way of our assuming that *ἐμίν*, etc., were the regular emphatic forms in all the West Greek dialects, and perhaps in Boeotian, while in the East Greek dialects they were replaced by *ἐμοί*, etc., Hom. *τείν* being the only survival of this type.

17. *ἐμέος* = *ἐμοῦ*. The genitives *ἐμέος*, *τέος*, and in later form *ἐμεῦς*, *ἐμῖος*, etc., are widely quoted from Doric writers by the grammarians. See Ahrens II, pp. 248 ff. The only inscriptional example of this type is Locr. *φέος* *SGDI*. 1478. 33, where *κατὰ φέος* is unquestionably to be taken with Meister as = *καθ' ἑαυτοῦ*. But there are no other early occurrences of the genitive singular of personal pronouns in the West Greek dialects, so that there is no improbability in assuming that the type in *-εος* was common to them all.

18. *τῆνος* = *ἐκείνος*. Although formed from a different stem than *ἐκείνος*, *κείνος*, *κῆνος*, it is synonymous with the latter. See now W. Havers, *Indog. Forsch.* XIX (1906), pp. 76 ff. *τῆνος* is frequent in the Doric of the Sicilian writers, especially Theocritus, and from inscriptions it is attested for Heraclea (*Her. Tab.* I. 136), Delphi (*τηνεί* *SGDI*. 2561 C. 27), Aegina (*ibid.* 3409), and Ithaca (*ibid.* 1671). Cf. also Meg. *τηνῶθεν* or *τηνῶθεν* in

Aristoph. *Ach.* 754. But *κῆνος* is the form employed in Cretan (*SGDI.* 4998. 4), Rhodian (*ibid.* 3758. 126), Coan (*ibid.* 3636. 25), and Laconian (Alcman 10). In the inscriptions of the other West Greek dialects the pronoun does not occur at all, if we except some late examples of Att. *ἐκείνος*. In the East Greek dialects we have Att. *ἐκείνος*, Ion. *κείνος*, *ἐκείνος*, Lesb. *κῆνος*, but no examples from Thess., Boeot., Arc., or Cyprian. *τῆνος* is, then, found only among West Greek dialects, but is not one of the general West Greek characteristics.

19. *αἰτοσαντός*. The expression of the reflexive by means of *αὐτός* *αἰτός*, either with each part declined separately, or, more often, merged into compounds of somewhat varying form (*αἰτοσαντός*, *αἰταντός*, *αἰσαντός*, *αἰσωτός*, *ἄσωτός*) is found mainly among West Greek dialects and in Boeotian. This is certainly not an inherited West Greek characteristic, but a comparatively late development, of which there are some traces even in Attic (Kühner-Blass I, p. 600), and one which we have no right to assume, without specific evidence, for all the West Greek dialects. In some of the dialects from which it is quotable it belongs only to the later inscriptions, the earlier expression being by means of the personal pronoun with *αὐτός*, as in Homer, or by *αὐτός* alone. The most numerous examples of *αἰτοσαντός*, etc., are in Boeotian (Sadée, *De Boeot. tit. dial.*, p. 38) and Delphian (*SGDI.*, Index, p. 188). But they are all late, and in earlier Delphian we have *αὐτός* alone, as *αὐτ[οῦ] = ἐμαντοῦ* *SGDI.* 2501. 4 and *αὐτό = ἐαντοῦ* *ibid.* 2501. 41. Cf. Lac. *αὐτό = ἐαντοῦ* *SGDI.* 4416 *passim*, El. *αὐτᾶρ = ἐαντῆς* *ibid.* 1172. 17, not to mention numerous examples from later Doric inscriptions where it is uncertain whether to read, e. g., *αἰτοῦ* or Att. *αἰτοῦ*. In late Cretan we find *αἰτοσαντοῖς* *SGDI.* 5149. 32, 61, *αἰτοσαντῶ* *ibid.* 5150, 5138 (all of ii cent.) and also *αἰσαντᾶς* *ibid.* 4959, but in the Law Code *ἐν αὐτοῖ = ἐαντῶ* (II. 40), and *τὰ γὰ αὐτᾶς = τὰ ἐαντῆς* (II. 46), etc. *αἰσαντᾶς* occurs also in a late inscription of Calauria, *SGDI.* 3380. Heracleian has *αἰτοσαντῶν*, *Her. Tab.* I. 124, and *αἰταντᾶς* *SGDI.* 4630, this latter of a type which is frequent in the fragments of Archytas of Tarentum and other Pythagoreans. Cf. also *αἰταντόν* from Aegina, *SGDI.* 3418. From Sicily we have also *αἰτώντα*, *SGDI.* 3249, and *αἰτούτα*, *ibid.* 5188, 5199, on the formation of which see Wackernagel *Kuhn's Zeitschr.* XXXIII, p. 9.

20. Future passive with active endings. Rhod. *ἐπιμεληθησέντι* *SGDI.* 4118, *ἀποσταλησεί*, Kern *Insc. von Magnesia* 53. 24, Carpath. *ἀναγραφησεί* *SGDI.* 4319, Astyp. *ἐπιμεληθη[σ]εί* *ibid.* 3459. 25, Ther. *συναγθησούντι* *ibid.* 4706. 25, Cret. *ἀναγραφησ[εί]* *ibid.* 5149. 19. Hesychius quotes as Doric *ᾠαποθησῶ· ἀκούσομαι*. Archimedes has *φανησείν*, *δειχθησούντι*, but usually the middle endings. See Ahrens II, p. 289. Meg. *ἀντεθησείται* *SGDI.* 3052. 22 (Chalcedon), and *ἀνατεθησείται*, *ibid.* 3089. 38 (Callatis), may owe their *-ται* to κοινή influence.

Blass *Rhein. Mus.* XXXVI (1881), p. 612, is emphatically of the



opinion, already expressed by Ahrens, that this is a general Doric characteristic. While this is probable, it must nevertheless be noted that the inscriptional examples, in spite of their gradual increase in number, are still confined to the Doric islands.

21. Adverbs in  $-\nu$  =  $-\varsigma$ . Various adverbs, not all of the same type, show  $-\nu$  in place of usual  $-\varsigma$  in several West Greek dialects, but in no case is there yet sufficient evidence that this was a common West Greek characteristic. (1) Numeral adverbs. Lac. *τετράκιν*, *ἐπτάκιν*, etc. *SGDI*. 4413, 4416, Cret. *ὀθθακίν* *Mus. Ital.* III, p. 681, No. 112, with which belong also Cret. *αὐτιν*, Law Code IV. 3, *αὐταμέριν* *SGDI*. 4999, El. *ῥσταριν*, Solmsen *Inscr. select.* 40, and probably Thess. *ἀν* *SGDI*. 361 B. 12. *αὐθιν* is also quoted as Rhegian, Ahrens II, p. 87. Most of the Doric dialects have only the usual forms in  $-\kappa\iota\varsigma$ , as Heracl. *ὀσσάκεις*, Calymn. *πολλάκεις*, etc., though there is perhaps no example so old as to preclude the possibility of *κοινή* influence. (2) Epid. *ἄνευν* = *ἄνευ*, *SGDI*. 3325. 58, but El. *ἄνευς*. (3) *ἐμπάν* beside *ἐμπᾶς* = *ἐμπης* in Pindar. (4) *ἐξᾶν* or *ἐξᾶν* (Schulze *Quaest. ep.*, p. 293) = *ἐξῆς*, in Coan, *SGDI*. 3705. 80, Rhodian, *ibid.* 3756. 10, 3836. 108, and Theran, *ibid.* 4706. 156.

22. *Ἀπέλλων* = *Ἀπόλλων*. This is quoted as Doric by Herodian, and is frequent in Laconian, e. g., *SGDI*. 4515, 4537 ff. It occurs also in Pamphylian, *ibid.* 1267. 30, in Cretan, *ibid.* 4952. 20, 24, 5073. 24 in an archaic inscription of Syracuse, *ibid.* 3327, and in one from Corinth or some Corinthian colony found at Delphi (*Sitzungsber. Berl. Acad.* 1888, p. 581). Its existence in the colonies of Magna Graecia is evidenced by early Latin *Apello* (Festus), and Oscan *Apelluneis*, *Ἀπελλουνη*. In the Doric islands of the Aegean, except Crete, we find only *Ἀπόλλων* even in the earliest times, e. g., Ther. *Ἀπόλ(λ)όν* *SGDI*. 4713 (archaic), Rhod. *Ἀπολ(λ)ωνίδα* *ibid.* 4223 (v cent.). This might easily be due to the influence of the Delian cult. But *Ἀπέλλων* is also the only form occurring in Argolis, e. g., in the early law concerning sacrifices at the Asclepieum, *IG*. IV. 914, in Megara, e. g., *IG*. VII. 35 (the often-repeated mention of Megarian among the dialects which show *Ἀπέλλων* is due to *CIG*. 1065, where the reading will not stand; see *IG*. VII. 179), and in the Megarian colonies, e. g., in the inscription from the Apollo temple at Selinus, *SGDI*. 3046. Among the Northwest Greek dialects *Ἀπόλλων* is the only form in Delphian, while from Locrian and Elean there are no examples. It is possible to take the ground that in all these cases *Ἀπόλλων* is an East Greek survival, but in the light of the existing evidence I doubt very much if the distribution of the two forms ever coincided with the division of East and West Greek dialects. We can hardly say more than that *Ἀπέλλων* survived in some of the Doric dialects, while in most others, whether East or West Greek, the form was *Ἀπόλλων*. Cyprian has *Ἀπείλων* beside *Ἀπόλλων*, and Thessalian stands alone with its *Ἀπλου*.

I have ignored Ἀπελλαῖος, Ἀπελλᾶς, etc., which are found in dialects which have only Ἀπόλλων, and are not even confined to West Greek.

23. λῶ = θέλω, βούλομαι. This verb, which is related to Latin *volō* (\**ϕλη-έω*, Cret. λῆτω(?), λείω), is often mentioned by grammarians as the Doric equivalent of θέλω, and is used by Epicharmus and Theocritus. As Laconian it is attested by Aristoph. *Lys.*, Thuc. v. 77, and by the Hesychian gloss λῆϊς· βούλησις. In inscriptions it occurs frequently in Cretan (Law Code and elsewhere), once each in Elean, λεοίταν *SGDI*. 1151, Megarian, λῶντι *SGDI*. 3045 b, at Corcyra, λῶντι (dat. sing., pple.), *SGDI*. 3206. 120, and its restoration seems certain in a Coan inscription, Ditt. *Syll.*<sup>2</sup> 940. 5, 6 τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ὁ χρήζων ἐπεί κα [λῆ].

The most widespread verb of wishing in the dialects, West as well as East Greek, is that which corresponds to Att.-Ion. βούλομαι, namely, Thess. βέλλομαι, Boeot. βείλομαι (Lesb. βόλλομαι in Theocritus), Arc. βόλομαι (also in Homer and in West Ionic), Locr. Delph. δείλομαι, and δήλομαι in Elis, Heraclea, Anaphe, Cos, Calymna, Thera.

θέλω is almost wholly confined to late inscriptions, where it is, I believe, an importation from the κοινή. It is very common in the Delphian manumission decrees, while δείλομαι occurs only four times (always in the same phrase, but even in this θέλω is usual).

Another important verb of wishing is χρήζω, which in Attic-Ionic, while sometimes so used, never becomes a serious rival of θέλω or βούλομαι. Although it also occurs elsewhere, as Delph. ὁ δὲ χρήζων καταγορεῖν *SGDI*. 2561 A. 38, El. αἰ χαῖδ(δ)οι *ibid.* 1160, Troiz. δαῖναι χρ[ήζ]ων *IG*. IV. 760 (here perhaps poetical influence), its frequent employment is characteristic of insular Doric. In Rhodes it is the usual verb of wishing, δήλομαι not occurring, e. g., ἐξέστωι τῶι χρήζ(ο)ντι *SGDI*. 3836. 95, ποταγγελλέτω . . . ὁ χρήζων ἐς τοὺς μάστρους *ibid.* 4110. 33-35, ἀποδοσεῦνται τῶι χρήζοντι ἐλαχίστου παρασχέιν τὰν στάλαν *ibid.* 4118. 7, 8. In Cos δήλομαι is more frequent, but cf. τῶι [χ]ρήζ[οντ]ι ἐσαγγέλλειν *SGDI*. 3627, φανερόν σκοπεῖν τῶι χρήζοντι, *ibid.* 3705. 70, while in 3721 we find ἐξῆμεν . . . τῶι χρήζοντι and ἦμεν . . . ταῖς χρηζο[ύ]σαις beside ἦμεν τῶι δηλομέναι. So from Calymna εἴ κα χρειζονται παρήμεν *SGDI*. 3591. 27, from Astypalaea ὅπαι κα χρήζ(ι)ν *ibid.* 3459, φαινέτω ὁ χρήζων ἐπὶ τῶι ἡμίσει *IG*. XII. iii. 168. 12, from Nisyros [φαινέτω δὲ] ὁ χρήζων ἐπὶ [τῶι ἡμίσει], *IG*. XII. iii. 88, from Thera ὑπὸ τοῦ χρήζοντος τῶν συγγενῶν *SGDI*. 4706. 266 (but προαιρέομαι in ll. 50, 75, 251; δήλομαι in 4705). In a Cretan inscription of Itanus, *SGDI*. 5058, which is in the Doric κοινή imported from the other islands, we find also αἶ τί[ς κα χρ]ή[ι]ζη.

24. Masculine *ā*-stems with nom. sing. in -*ā*, gen. sing. in -*ās*. Although the usual type in all dialects is that in -*ās* (-ης), gen. -*āo* (-*ā*, -*ew*, etc.), formed after the analogy of masculine *o*-stems, there are some scattered examples of the unchanged declension in -*ā*, gen. -*ās*. Such forms have so far appeared only among West Greek dialects (including Boeotian

and Thess.), and, more specifically, excepting some Megarian genitives in  $-ās$ , in northwestern Greece, namely Epirus, Acarnania, Aetolia, Leucas, Cephallenia, Delphi, Boeotia, and Thessaly (Phalanna). See Solmsen, *Rhein. Mus.* LIX (1904), pp. 494 f., who cites the material in full.

25. Hypocristic proper names in  $-ην$ , as  $Ἀριστήν$  for usual  $Ἀρίστων$ . These are found mostly in Corinth, Coreyra and especially Apollonia and Epidamnus. See the examples collected by Blass *SGDI.* 3225.  $Πυρρήν$  *IG.* IV. 1485. 37 is an Epidaurian, and from Thera we have  $Ψήν$ , *IG.* XII. iii. 591. There may be, unknown to me, examples from some of the other West Greek dialects, but most of them, certainly, have only the usual  $-ων$ .

I have omitted from this chart various peculiarities which, while they are common to the West Greek dialects and are often referred to casually as "Doric," are not confined to these even in the widest application of the term, and have no claim to be regarded as distinctively West Greek. So, for example, the retention of original  $\bar{a}$  or the contraction of  $\bar{a}o$  and  $\bar{a}w$  to  $\bar{a}$ , absence of  $\nu$ -movable, forms like  $\xi\theta\epsilon\nu$ , and other phenomena which are common to all dialects except Attic-Ionic (see 40-44);  $\alpha\iota = \epsilon\iota$ , and  $\kappa\epsilon$  or  $\kappa\alpha = \bar{a}\nu$  (see 45, 46); the infinitive in  $-\mu\epsilon\nu$  (see 47, 59); words like  $\dot{\iota}\kappa\omega = \dot{\eta}\kappa\omega$ ,  $\pi\hat{\alpha}\mu\alpha = \kappa\tau\hat{\eta}\mu\alpha$ , etc. which are by no means confined to West Greek.  $\bar{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma = \epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$  is quotable from various Doric dialects (Coreyra, Cos, Crete, Epid., Mess., also lit. Doric), from Arcadian (*BCH.* XXV [1901], p. 267), is cited as Boeotian (*Et. Gud.* 256. 2) and Lesbian (Herodian I. 507. 6), and is also seen in Att.  $\bar{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$  with crasis (Kühner-Blass I, p. 223). As far as we know,  $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$  was confined to Attic-Ionic, all examples in other dialects being late.

One phenomenon which I am disposed to reckon in this category, though it is commonly regarded as distinctively West Greek, is the contraction of  $\alpha\epsilon$  to  $\eta$ . Nearly all the West Greek dialects furnish examples of this in forms of verbs in  $-\alpha\omega$ , as  $\tau\mu\hat{\eta}\nu$ ,  $\nu\kappa\hat{\eta}\nu$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\kappa\eta$ , etc., or in crasis, as  $\kappa\hat{\eta}\pi\acute{\iota}$ ,  $\kappa\hat{\eta}\nu$ ,  $\kappa\hat{\eta}\kappa$ , etc. Boeotian also has  $\phi\upsilon\sigma\hat{\eta}\tau\epsilon$  and  $\kappa\hat{\eta}\pi\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\tau\tau\alpha\iota$  in Aristoph. *Ach.* 863, 884. Thessalian has  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma = \tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$  ( $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ ) and  $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu = \kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\epsilon}\nu$  in the Sotaerus inscription (Solmsen *Insc. select.* 10). And even Lesbian has  $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\epsilon} = \kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\epsilon}$  in a sixth- or fifth-century inscription, Hoffmann II. 179, Meister *Berl. phil. Woch.* 1892, col. 514, which confirms the  $\kappa\hat{\eta}\nu$  in Sappho 68, and the similar forms in Theocritus, though otherwise in Sappho we find  $\kappa\bar{\alpha}$ - (see Hoffmann II, p. 292). These Thessalian and Lesbian examples of  $\eta$  in crasis are regarded by Meister as not representing the contraction of  $\alpha\epsilon$ , but as following the other system of crasis, consisting of lengthening of the second vowel. See *Ber. sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss.* 1896, p. 264, and *Herodas*, pp. 787 ff. But we are not called upon to separate these from the similar forms of crasis in West Greek, until we have definite proof that  $\eta$  is not the regular contraction of  $\alpha\epsilon$  in

Lesbian and Thessalian. Such proof is not furnished by any of the verb-forms cited by Hoffmann II, 293, because of the uncertainty as to which type they belong, e. g., Thess. ἐποντᾶι may be of the -ᾱω type. In Arcado-Cyprian there is no evidence as to the contraction of αε. Hence, while the question must remain open until further material is available, it is quite possible that the contraction of αε to η is common to all dialects except Attic-Ionic.

26-34. These include the phenomena which distinguish the Northwest Greek dialects, including in part Boeotian and Thessalian, from the other West Greek dialects, the Doric proper, and also some of more limited scope and more doubtful significance.

26. ἐν = εἰς. All the Northwest Greek dialects together with Boeotian and Thessalian, and also Arcadian-Cyprian (ἰν), retain the inherited use of ἐν with the accusative (as in Latin), while the Doric dialects, like Attic-Ionic and Lesbian, replaced this by the extended form ἐνς (εἰς, ἐς). The distribution of the forms is independent of the old division into East and West Greek dialects. But it constitutes the most notable difference between the Northwest Greek dialects as a whole and the Doric dialects, and, for the later times, between the Northwest Greek κοινή and the Doric κοινή. On the alleged Megarian ἐν with acc. see Sadée *De Boeot. tit. dial.*, p. 28, note. ἐν στάλαν in a Messenian inscription, *Journ. Hell. Stud.* XXV (1905), p. 50, which the editor, *loc. cit.*, p. 53, calls "the first instance of ἐν = εἰς in Doric," is, I am convinced, to be attributed to Aetolian influence, which has long been recognized in late Messenian inscriptions (πάντοις, etc.; see 29).

The appearance of ἐς in a fifth-century inscription of Delphi, *BCH.* XXIII (1899), p. 611 (τὸν φοῖνον μὲ φάρεν ἐς τὸ [Εὐδρομον]) is surprising, from whatever light we view it.<sup>1</sup> For according to all the other evidence Delphian agreed with the other Northwest Greek dialects in having only ἐν, except as this came to be replaced in part by εἰς under Attic influence. Can this be an exceptionally early instance of Attic influence in Delphi?

ἐντε = ἔστε, parallel to ἐν = εἰς, is Locrian, Phocian (ἠέντε) and Northwest Greek κοινή, there being no example in Elean. Boeotian has ἐν, but ἔττε from ἔστε (otherwise Bechtel *Hermes* XXXVI [1901], who derives ἔττε from an unexplained \*εν-ττε).

27. καλέμενος = καλούμενος. Locr. ἐγκαλέμενος *SGDI.* 1478. 43, Delph. καλέμενος, ποιέμενος, ἀφαιρέμενος, χρεέμενος, etc. (*SGDI.* Index, p. 191), Aetol. ἀφικνέμενος *Kern Insc. von Magnesia* 91 c, Boeot. δέμενος *IG.* VII. 2858, ἀδικέμενος *Aristoph. Ach.* 914, El. κα(δ)δαλέμενος *SGDI.* 1149. These have the appearance of coming from -ε-εμενος instead of -ε-ομενος, but are

<sup>1</sup>See now Günther *Die Präpositionen in den griechischen Dialektinschriften*, pp. 8 ff., and Solmsen *Rhein. Mus.* LXI (1906), pp. 493 ff., whose views on the distribution of ἐν and ἐνς differ somewhat from those expressed above.

better explained as due to the analogy of other forms in which  $\epsilon$  or  $\eta$  (from  $\epsilon$ - $\epsilon$ ) is normal, just as Phoc. ποιένται *IG. IX. 1. 97* is formed after ποιείσθε, etc. See Danielsson *Epigraphica*, p. 45. Not to be confused with these are Lesb. καλήμενος, Thess. διασαφείμενος, Arc. ἀδικήμενος, etc., which go hand in hand with the other examples of  $\mu$ -inflection of contract verbs in these dialects. See 69. Pamph. βολέμενος probably belongs in this latter category also. Although there are some few  $\mu$ -forms in Elean, they are limited in scope and not found among  $-\epsilon\omega$  verbs, so that we are justified in reckoning El. κα(δ)δαλέμενος with the Northwest Greek forms. Likewise the Boeotian examples, since there is no trace of the Aeolic  $\mu$ -inflection in Boeotian inscriptions.

Lesb. ποείμενος in an inscription of Tenedos from about 150 B. C., *SGDI. 305*, is generally assumed to have the late spelling  $\epsilon$  for  $\eta$ . See Meister I, p. 85, Hoffmann II, p. 424. But as this is otherwise all but unknown even in the latest Lesbian inscriptions, it is scarcely more daring to suggest that this may be the Northwest Greek form, which had doubtless become widely known through Aetolian decrees. One must admit, however, that there is no other evidence of any Northwest Greek influence in Lesbian.

28. φάρω = φέρω. The change of  $\epsilon$  to  $\alpha$  before  $\rho$  has long been known as regular in Locrian and Elean, e. g., Locr. φάρειν, πατάρα, ἀνφοστάρους, ἀμάραις, etc., El. φάρῆν, πάρ = περί, ὀπόταροι, etc. That it was also Phocian is now seen from Delph. πενταμαριτεύων, δάρματα *SGDI. 2561 D. 16, 37*, and φάρεν, φάρῃ of a fifth-century inscription *BCH. XXIII (1899)*, p. 611. If elsewhere in Delphian we find only the usual  $\epsilon\rho$  this is due to the same external influence which gradually brought about the elimination of  $\alpha\rho$  =  $\epsilon\rho$  in Elean also, e. g., in the exile-decree, Solmsen, *Insc. select. 40*, ὕσταριν, but θηλυτέραν, περί, etc., and in the Damocrates decree, *SGDI. 1172*, always  $\epsilon\rho$ . It is only natural, then, that this peculiarity of the Northwest Greek dialects was also given up in the Northwest Greek κοινή. But a form corresponding to Locr., Delph. ἀμάραις is preserved in the Achaean Ζεὺς Ἀμάρτος, Ἀθάνη Ἀμαρία *SGDI. 1634* (see Ditt. *Syll.*<sup>2</sup> 229, note). ὕπαρ = ὕπερ is also Pamphylian *SGDI. 1267. 2*.

29. πάντοισ = πᾶσι. The dative plural of consonant stems in  $-\sigmaις$ , formed after the analogy of  $\sigma$ -stems, is characteristic of Locrian, Elean (but also  $-\sigmaσι$ , see 65), and the Northwest Greek κοινή, through which it gained a wide currency. The genuine Phocian form was  $-\sigmaσι$ , as shown by the earlier Delphian inscriptions (see 65). The forms in  $-\sigmaις$ , which are frequent in the later inscriptions of Delphi (see Index to *SGDI.*) and other parts of Phocis (e. g., Stiris *SGDI. 1539*; decree of the Phocian league, Kern *Insc. von Magnesia 34*), are importations from the Northwest Greek κοινή. There is no reason to doubt, in spite of G. Meyer *Gr. Gram.*<sup>3</sup>, p. 475, that this is true in general of the forms in  $-\sigmaις$  cited by him from other parts of Greece, and which can now be

considerably augmented. But this belongs to the general question of the spread of Northwest Greek *κοινή* forms through Aetolian influence, which cannot be discussed in detail at this point.

30.  $\sigma\tau = \sigma\theta$ . This spelling, the significance of which need not be discussed here (see Brugmann *Gr. Gram.*<sup>3</sup>, p. 106), is regularly employed in Locrian, e. g., *ηλέσται, ηaréσται*, etc., and in earlier Elean, e. g., *λυσάστω, χρέεσται*, etc. (later *ἀποδόσσαι*, etc.). Elsewhere it is only occasional, but it is significant that the earliest and the most numerous examples are in Phocian, e. g., Delph. *ηλαξάστω* in a fifth-century inscription, *BCH. XXIII* (1899), p. 611, *πρόστα SGDI. 2561 C. 40*, and in later inscriptions *γνέστω, καταδουλίσάστω*, etc. (*SGDI. Index*, p. 185), Stir. *θέστων, ἀποπολιτεύσασται ibid. 1539*. Cf. also Boeot. *ἀπολογίτταστη, καταδουλίτταστη*, etc., frequent in inscriptions of Orchomenos, Thess. *πεπέιστειν SGDI. 345. 16* (but otherwise *σθ*). There are scattering examples in many other parts of Greece, even in Athens, most of them late (see G. Meyer *Gr. Gram.*<sup>3</sup>, p. 352; Schweizer *Gram. d. pergamen. Inschriften*, p. 129), but not all, e. g., Cret. *μιστός SGDI. 5125*, Lac. *ἀποστρυθέσται ibid. 4564*. But these do not lessen the significance of the especial frequency of *στ* in Northwest Greece.

31. Dative singular in *-οι*. The prevalence and significance of this form is most difficult to determine. Owing to the lack of sufficient material from both the earlier and later periods, and the ambiguity of the pre-Ionic *-οι*, it is often impossible to say whether such a form is an inherited locative or has been shortened from *-οι* in the historical period of a given dialect, or again is borrowed from another dialect. It can hardly be claimed as a distinctive Northwest Greek characteristic. For although it is Elean, as well as Arcadian and Boeotian, it is not found in earlier Phocian (the earliest Delphian inscriptions in the Ionic alphabet have *-οι*), nor, so far as can be shown, in Locrian, though the usual transcription of the Locr. *-ΟΙ* as *-οι* is not based on any specific evidence. At the same time it is clear that in the later period this dative in *-οι* had considerable currency in Northwest Greece and adjacent regions. Aside from Boeotian, where it is regular, examples occur in Acarnania (*SGDI. 1379*; but *-οι* in the early fourth-century inscription of Stratus, *IG. IX. i. 442*), Epirus (*SGDI. 1339*; *-οι* and *-οι* side by side), Aetolia (*ibid. 1428. i*), Delphi (*ibid. Index*, p. 186; *-οι* in earlier Delphian), Cierium in the Thessaliotis (Hoffmann II. 63, 64; but in the early Sotaerus inscription *-ΟΙ* is to be transcribed *-οι*, cf. *ἐν ταγαᾶ*), and in Euboea with Oropus, where it replaces earlier *-οι* and without much doubt is due to the same shortening seen in *-ει* from *-ηι* (see Hoffmann III, pp. 440 f.; Bechtel, p. v of the preface to his publication of the Ionic inscriptions in *SGDI.*).

32. Accusative plural of consonant stems in *-ες* after the nominative. This cannot be claimed as a general Northwest Greek characteristic, but may be mentioned here, since, besides being the usual type in Elean and

Achaean, its probable starting-part, namely *τέτορες* used indeclinably like *πέντε*, etc. (Wackernagel *Indog. Forsch.* XIV, p. 368), is also early Delphian, as *μῆας δεκατέτορες* *SGDI.* 1683, and *ὁδελὸς τέτορες* Homolle *Mélanges Nicole*, p. 626. But otherwise Delphian has only the usual *-ας* (so even *τέτορας* usually), as Locrian always. On the other hand, the forms in *-ες* are found in late times in numerous dialects. See G. Meyer *Gr. Gram.*<sup>3</sup>, p. 463; Dieterich, *Unters. zur Gesch. d. griech. Sprache*, pp. 156 f.

33. *Ἰπποκλέας*. Proper names in *-κλέας* are by far most frequent in Thessaly, but include also some Boeotians, Phocians, and Aetolians. See Sadée *De Boeot. tit. dial.*, p. 27, and Fick-Bechtel *Griech. Eigennamen*, pp. 29, 169, who explain *-κλέας* as formed from *-κλος* with the hypocoristic *-ίας*. But instead of taking *-κλος* as an intermediate stage, why not assume a direct transfer from the uncontracted *-κλέης*, which is especially characteristic of Euboean? Note the distribution of the following.

34. *Φιλώνδας*. Patronymics in *-ωνδας* are nowhere else so common as in Boeotian (for the examples see Sadée *De Boeot. tit. dial.*, p. 105), but are not infrequent in Phocian and Euboean (*-ωνδης*). Thus *Δεξώνδας*, *Ἐτυμώνδας*, *Ἱερώνδας*, *Κλεώνδας*, *Ξενώνδας*, *Πατρώνδας*, are Delphians, some of the names being of very frequent occurrence (see *SGDI.* Index, pp. 205 ff.), *Ἀρχώνδας* *ibid.* 2214. 19 is from Elatea, and *Χαιρώνδας* *ibid.* 2002. 9 from Ambryssus. For Euboean, cf. Eretr. *Σιμώνδης*, *Ξενώνδης*, *Μενώνδης*, *Στρατώνδης* *SGDI.* 5313. 4, 32, 155–6, 236, 242, and other examples from Eretria, Styra, Histiaea, *ibid.* 5325, 5342, 5345, with notes. *Τιμώνδας* mentioned as one of the Ionian representatives on the amphyctionic council *SGDI.* 2504. 27 was doubtless from Euboea. And it is probably through the Chalcidian influence that *-ωνδας*, though with Doric ending, appears in Sicily, namely in *Φιλώνδας* Theocr. iv. 1, and *Χαρώνδας*, the name of the legislator of Catana and the other Chalcidian cities of Sicily and Italy (Plato *Rep.* x. 599 e, Arist. *Polit.* 1274 a). Thess. *Λεοῦνδας* *SGDI.* 345. 68. A Sicyonian *Δαιτώνδας* is mentioned by Pausanias vi. 17. 5.

The parallel, but less common, *-ωνδας*, is attested for Boeotian, Thessalian, and Euboean. See Schulze *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1897, p. 899.

35–39. These peculiarities, which are common to Thessalian and Boeotian but are not, like 60 ff., to be attributed to the Aeolic element in both, are given here for convenience.

35. *αι = η*, as *μέι = μή*.—36 *θ* for *τ* in third plural verb-endings. See above under 1. 1.—37. *Δῶσδοτος*, *Θεῶσδοτος*. See Solmsen *Rhein. Mus.* LIX (1904), pp. 498 ff.—38. *γίννμαι = γίγνομαι*, e. g., Boeot. *γινούμενον* *SGDI.* 385, Thess. *γινύεται* *ibid.* 345. 22, 45.—39. *ἐλεξε = εἶπε*. Boeotian and Thessalian decrees regularly have *ἐλεξε* where *εἶπε* is used in Attic and elsewhere.

*East Greek*

40-44. Some of the most marked characteristics of Attic-Ionic.

40.  $\eta$  from  $\bar{a}$ .—41.  $\lambda\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ . This stands for quantitative metathesis in general. The phenomenon as a whole is distinctly Attic-Ionic, though its details are not always identical in the two dialects.—42.  $\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ . This stands for the secondary formation of the nominative and accusative plural of the personal pronouns, namely, nom.  $-\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , acc.  $-\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma$ ,  $-\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ , where other dialects have nom.  $-\epsilon\varsigma$ , acc.  $-\epsilon$ , as West Greek  $\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$  ( $\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ ),  $\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\epsilon}$ , Lesb.  $\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\epsilon\varsigma$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\epsilon$ , Thess.  $\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\acute{\epsilon}$ . In Arcado-Cyprian examples are lacking.—43.  $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu$ . The  $\nu$ -movable in the verbal endings  $-\epsilon\nu$ ,  $-\sigma\iota\nu$  occurs in the earliest Attic and Ionic inscriptions, but in other dialects is wholly unknown until a late period, and is a sure sign of *κοινή* influence. In the dative plural it is almost, but not quite, confined to Attic-Ionic, examples occurring in Heracleian ( $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\alpha\sigma\sigma\iota\nu$ ) and Thessalian ( $\chi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$  in the Sotaerus inscription).—44.  $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$ . The extension of  $-\sigma\alpha\nu$  from the  $\sigma$ -aorist to forms like  $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\sigma\alpha\nu$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ , etc., is peculiar to Attic-Ionic. Most other dialects have the more original  $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\nu$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\sigma\nu$ , etc., while another secondary formation is seen in Boeot.  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\iota\alpha\nu$ , Cyp.  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\iota\alpha\nu$ , Thess.  $\delta\acute{\nu}\epsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\nu$ , etc.

45-48. Attic-Ionic and Arcadian (-Cyprian) characteristics.

45.  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ . The conditional conjunction is  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$  only in Attic-Ionic and Arcadian;  $\eta$  in Cyprian (it occurs also in Heracleian and Cretan, but not as the simple conditional);  $\alpha\acute{\iota}$  in all other dialects, namely Lesbian, Boeotian, Thessalian, and the West Greek dialects.

46.  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ . In all dialects but Attic-Ionic and Arcadian the particle corresponding in use to  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$  is  $\kappa\epsilon$  or  $\kappa\alpha$ . See above, 8. Even in Arcadian  $\kappa\epsilon$  must have been employed once, as in Cyprian, and after its function was usurped by  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ , it still appeared between  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$  and  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ , where hiatus would otherwise result, e. g.,  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$   $\kappa'$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu$  beside  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$   $\delta'$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ . The introduction of  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ , and perhaps of  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ , both of which are Arcadian, but not Cyprian, is very probably to be ascribed to the influence (prehistoric) of the Ionic population which there is every reason to believe once occupied a part of the eastern coast of the Peloponnesus.

47. Infinitive in  $-\nu\alpha\iota$ . Attic-Ionic  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\nu\alpha\iota$ ,  $\delta\omicron\delta\nu\alpha\iota$ , etc., Arc.  $\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ , etc., Cyp.  $\delta\omicron\phi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$ ,  $\kappa\nu\mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$ . For the infinitive of such unthematic forms all other dialects have  $-\mu\epsilon\nu$  or closely related forms ( $-\mu\eta\nu$ ,  $-\mu\epsilon\nu$ ,  $-\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ ).

48-54. Characteristics peculiar to Arcado-Cyprian.<sup>1</sup>

48.  $\acute{\iota}\nu=\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ . This appears uniformly in Arcadian and Cyprian, both alone and in compounds, and shows a change of  $\epsilon\nu$  to  $\acute{\iota}\nu$  which is now paralleled by  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\chi\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\nu\delta\epsilon\delta\omicron\mu\nu[\omicron\varsigma=\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\chi\omicron\mu\omicron\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\delta\epsilon\delta\omicron\mu\omicron\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ , in the

<sup>1</sup>To these should perhaps have been added the proper names in  $-\kappa\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\eta\varsigma$  =  $-\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\varsigma$ , which are usual in Arcadian and Cyprian (Hoffmann I, pp. 141 f.) but not surely attested elsewhere, though  $\kappa\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\varsigma$  is Lesbian (Hoffmann II, p. 309). A new example is  $\Sigma\alpha\kappa\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\eta\varsigma$  from Lusi, *Wiener Jahresheft* IV (1901), p. 65.



early Mantinean inscription, Fougères *Mantinee*, pp. 523 ff., though its precise conditions are still obscure (cf. *ἐδικάσαμεν* in the same inscription). Elsewhere *iv* is very rare, occurring only in some Cretan inscriptions of Eleutherna, and Vaxus, *SGDI*. 4954 (*ivḡμεν*), *ibid.* 5125 (*iv* beside *ἐν*, *ἴναντι*; cf. *ijs=ēs*, *is* also in 5128), *ibid.* 5148. 8, and in an Achaean inscription, *SGDI*. 1643, according to the reading *δὸς δὲ ϛ' iv ἀνθρώποις* (see Schulze *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1890, col. 1439).

49. Genitive singular in *-av*. This *-āv* from *-āo* is simply the most frequent and uniform manifestation of a change of final *o* to *v*, which in the case of *ἀπύ=ἀπό* is also Lesbian and Thessalian (see p. 274), but in the main is specifically Arcado-Cyprian, as in Arc. *ἄλλv=ἄλλo* (also *κατύ* formed after *ἀπύ*), Cyp. *γένοιtv, ἐφρέτάσαtv* with middle ending *-tv=-to*. Cf. also, though not a case of final *o*, Cyp. *ἰνέθεκε* beside *ὀνέθεκε*, and Arc. *ἰνέθvσε* (see *Ath. Mitth.* XXI (1896), pp. 240 ff. and especially *ibid.* XXX (1905), pp. 65 f.),<sup>1</sup> both with *iv* from *ὀv=ἀv* (see 68). The Pamphylian change of *o* to *v* is not parallel, being of much wider scope.

50. *πός=πρός*. This has the East Greek *σ*, but otherwise goes with *ποτί* rather than with *προτί, πρόσ*. See above, under 1. 4.

51. *σις=τις*. *σις* is the regular form in Cyprian (once *τι* in a metrical inscription), and in Arcadian *σις* and *είσε* occur in the early Mantinean inscription, Fougères *Mantinee*, pp. 523 ff., the sibilant in these words being differentiated from the ordinary *σ* by the use of a simplified form of the san instead of the usual sigma. All other inscriptions have only *τις*. Compare also the Arcadian glosses *ζέρεθρον=δέρεθρον* and *ζέλλω=δέλλω* against the inscriptional *ἐσδέλλοντες*. Brugmann *Gr. Gram.*<sup>3</sup>, p. 116 is inclined to assume a local variation within Arcadian. I believe on the contrary that the sibilant pronunciation was characteristic of Arcadian in general, as of Cyprian, and that *τις* and also *καί* (see below), though appearing too early to be due to the *κοινή*, are nevertheless due to external influence. But this involves a general problem of the early elimination of certain dialectic peculiarities by external influence, which I hope to discuss elsewhere.

52. *κάς=καί*. This, with occasional *κα*, is the regular form in Cyprian, but in Arcadian is quotable only from the early Mantinean inscription just cited, all other sources showing only *καί*. I assume that *κάς* was once general Arcadian as well as Cyprian, and was supplanted by *καί* under external influence. See above.

53. *ὄvv=ὄδε*. Cyp. *ὄvv, τόν(v)v*, Arc. *τάνv, τόνvν*, this last from the Mantinean inscription just cited. Here belong also *τάνvνν, τόσσvνν* in the late and mixed Arcadian inscription from Megalopolis, Kern *Inscr. von*

<sup>1</sup> I have no doubt whatever that *IGA*. 556 *φομάρας ἰνέθεκε* is also Arcadian, though the object may have reached the antiquarian market by way of Sparta or Elis, assuming that either of the two divergent reports as to its provenance is to be trusted.

*Magnesia* 38. 48, 49=Ditt. *Syll.*<sup>2</sup> 258, only they are written here as if containing *ννν*, like *τίς ννν, τοίννν*.

54. Dative with *ἀπύ*, etc. The dative instead of the usual genitive construction is attested for both Arcadian and Cyprian after *ἀπύ*, *ἐξ*, and *περί*, and for Arcadian, examples being lacking in Cyprian, after *ὑπέρ* and *ὑπό*. To the examples with *ἀπύ*, *ἐξ*, and in Arcadian with *περί*, which are given by Hoffmann I, pp. 307, 311, add now Arc. *περὶ τοινί* and *ὑπὸ ταῖ πόλι* from Kern *Inscr. von Magnesia* 38, 31, 47 (also in l. 8 *περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν πάνσιν διαλεχθέσσι*, with confusion of the Arcadian and normal Greek construction), and *ὑπὲρ ταῖ τᾶς πόλιος ἐλευθερίαι* *BCH. XVI* (1892), p. 543. A similar construction in Pamphylian, and in Boeot. *προτηνί*, i. e., *πρὸ ται-νί* (*sc. ἀμέραι*), according to Meister *Sitzungsber. d. sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss.* 1904, p. 9.

55-65. Aeolic characteristics.

55. *ἐμμί, στάλλα*. This stands for the whole group of words in which Lesbian and Thessalian show double nasals and liquids resulting from various consonant groups which in all other dialects yield a single nasal or liquid with lengthening of the preceding vowel, if short. For material, including, however, some that does not belong here, see Hoffmann II, pp. 479 ff.

Solmsen, *Rhein. Mus.* LVIII (1903), p. 623, note, suggests that the name of the mythical Ἴμμάραδος of Eleusis (Paus. i. 5. 2; 27. 4; 38. 3) belongs here and is evidence of a time when Aeolic was spoken in this region. See below, 65, on the Aeolic element in Corinth.

56. *ῥα=μία*. This is found only in Lesbian, Thessalian, and in Homer. Cretan *ῥός*, though doubtless related in form, is not a numeral, but has about the force of *ἐκείνος*. See *Class. Phil.* I, pp. 409 ff.

57. *ι > ι̇*. The consonantal pronunciation of antevocalic *ι*, which might occur anywhere in rapid speech, was especially characteristic of Lesbian and Thessalian, as manifested by the following phenomena. (1) Lesb. *ζ* from *δι* in *ζά, κάρζα, Ζόννσος*, all from glosses or late inscriptions, the usual inscriptional spelling being *διά*, etc. *Ζιονύ(σιος)* on a coin of Phocaea and other forms with *ζ* from Phocaeian colonies in Sicily are among the linguistic evidences of what is naturally assumed from its situation, namely that Phocaea was originally Aeolic, not Ionic. The name of the Locrian Ζάλευκος may also be Aeolic. See Solmsen, *Kuhn's Zeitschr.* XXXIV, pp. 554 ff. and *Rhein. Mus.* LIX, p. 493, footnote. Cf. also Cypr. *κορζία· καρδία* (Hesych.), etc. (2) Lesb. *μέτερος* (Herodian) = *μέτριος*, the development being *τρι > τοι > τερι > τεpp*. For other examples, see Hoffmann II, pp. 320 f. (3) Thess. doubling of consonants before *ι*, which may then be retained or omitted in the spelling, e. g., *ἰδδίαν, πόλλιος, ἀργύριοι* beside *ἀργύριοι, κῦρρον* beside *κύριον, Μνασσᾶ=Μνασία, γυμνασσαρχείσαντα*, etc. See Solmsen *Rhein. Mus.* LVIII, p. 612, with the literature cited. (4) Omission of *ι*, e. g., Lesb. *ἄργυρα=ἀργύρια*,

Thess. *τρακάδι*=*τριακάδι*, *Διονύσσοι*=*Διονυσίοι*, etc. The supposed Boeotian parallels, Sadée *De Boeot. tit. dial.*, pp. 12 f., are doubtful. See Solmsen *Rhein. Mus.* LIX, pp. 492 ff.

58. *καλέσαι*. The extension of *σσ* from *τελέσαι*, etc., to short-vowel stems, as in *καλέσαι*, *ὁμόσαι*, etc., which has long been known as Lesbian and Homeric (see Schulze *Kuhn's Zeitschr.* XXXIII, pp. 126 ff.), is now attested for Boeotian also by *συνκαλέσαντες*, *Rev. ét. grec.* XII (1899), pp. 69 ff. In Thessalian there are no such forms, on the contrary *ὁμόσαντες* beside *πάντεσσι*, etc., which keep *σσ* uniformly.

59. *φέρειμεν*. The extension of *-μεν* from *τιθέμεν*, etc., to thematic forms is as regular in Boeotian, as *φερέμεν*, *γραφέμεν*, etc., and in Thessalian of the Pelasgiotis, as *ὑπαρχέμεν*, *πρασσέμεν*, etc., while in the Thessaliotis we find the usual thematic formation as *ἔχειν ἐξανακάδεν*. Since *εἶπέμεν*, *εἶπέμεναι* occur also in Homer, we may reckon this among the Aeolic elements of Boeotian and Thessalian, in spite of the fact that Lesbian inscriptions have only *ἔχην*, etc.

60. *ρε* for *ρι*. An open pronunciation of *ι* after *ρ* in Lesbian and Thessalian is indicated by occasional spellings, such as Lesb. *Δαμοκρέτω*, Thess. *κρεννέμεν*. For other examples see Hoffmann II, p. 320. A probable example of the same thing in Boeotian is *τρέπεδδα*, which occurs beside *τράπεδδα*. Cf. Hesych. *τρίπεζαν· τὴν τράπεζαν. Βοιωτοί*. So Schulze *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1897, p. 904. El. *πόλερ*=*πόλις* with *ε* before *ρ*, like *αρ* from *ερ*, probably has no genetic connection with the preceding, although physiologically related. Lesb. *κέρνᾱν*=*κιννάνα* owes its *κερ* to *ἐκέρασα*, etc.

61. *πέμπε*=*πέντε*. This stands for the representation of an original labio-velar (likewise palatal + *u*) before a front vowel by a labial instead of a dental, as in Lesb., Thess. *πέμπε*=*πέντε*, Lesb. *πέσσυρες*, Hom. *πίσυρες*, Boeot. *πέτταρες*=*τέτταρες*, etc. Examples are so numerous in Lesbian, Thessalian, and Boeotian, as to show that this is a phonetic development characteristic of these dialects, although the reasons for the divergent treatment in certain words, as *τις*, *τε*, *τιμά*, etc., are still not satisfactorily cleared up. But Cypr. *πίσει*=*τείσει* is to be classed rather with the isolated instances of analogical substitution, such as may be found in any dialect (Att. *βέλος*, etc.). For all other evidence indicates that Arcado-Cyprian did not share in this Aeolic peculiarity.

The Thessalian examples are not only from the Pelasgiotis, but also from the Thessaliotis, e. g., in the Sotaerus inscription *βελφαῖο*=*\*Δελφαίου*, *Δελφινίου* (cf. Lesb., Boeot. *βελφοί*=*Δελφοί*). In certain Boeotian proper names, such as *Τελεφάνεις* beside *Πιλεράχω* etc., Solmsen, *Rhein. Mus.* LIX, pp. 481 ff., thinks we should recognize forms inherited from the West-Greek constituent of the dialect and existing beside the usual Aeolic. But none of the clear examples are old enough to preclude the other possibility, also recognized by Solmsen, that they are due to the influence of the forms current in most other dialects and in the

κοινή. And in the present state of the evidence this appears to me more probable.

62. Perfect participle in -ων. The thematic inflection of the perfect active participle, as in Hom. κεκλήγοντες, is regular in Lesbian, Boeotian, and Thessalian (both East and West), e. g., Lesb. κατεληλύθοντος, Boeot. *φεφυκονομειόντων, δεδώωση* (nom. pl. fem.), Thess. *πεφειράκοντες* (Larissa), *ἐπεστάκοντα* (Cierium), etc. The feminine forms in -ουσα which occur elsewhere, e. g., *δεδωκούσας* in later Delphian, represent a more restricted phenomenon which is quite independent of the preceding. See Solmsen *Kuhn's Zeitschr.* XXXIX, p. 215.

A late inscription of Cyrene published by Fränkel, from a copy of Fourmont, in the *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad.* 1903, pp. 83 ff., contains *προγεγονούσας*, which is identical with the Lesbian feminine forms, even to the *οισ* from *ονσ*, of which the present participle *ἀνγίκοσαν* in the same inscription furnishes another example. But, while the previously known *τελεσφορέντες* (see 69) has prepared us for "Aeolisms" in the widest sense at Cyrene, that is, characteristics which are Achæan as well as Aeolic, I see no possibility of viewing *προγεγονούσας* in the same light, since neither the thematic inflection of the perfect participle nor the change of *ονσ* to *οισ* can be Achæan (cf. Arcadian), and the latter is not even common to the Aeolic dialects but purely Lesbian (in Elean only in the case of final -*νς*). One would have to assume rather, with Fränkel, *loc. cit.*, that there were Aeolians from Lesbos or vicinity among the islanders who, according to Herod. iv. 161, formed part of the population of Cyrene. But I cannot conceal my suspicion that the language of the inscription in question, which belongs to the Roman period, is artificial, and that, while it contains genuine native forms, as the accusative plural in -*ος*, the participles cited no more belong to the dialect of Cyrene than do *ἄμμε, διαλεχθέσσι*, etc. in the Megalopolis inscription, Kern *Inscr. von Magnesia* 38, to Arcadian.

63. The use of the patronymic adjective instead of the genitive singular of the father's name. This is a characteristic of Lesbian, Thessalian, and Boeotian, of which there are almost countless examples. For certain general classes of exceptions, see especially Sadée *De Boeot. tit. dial.*, pp. 17 ff., Solmsen *Rhein. Mus.* LVIII, pp. 603 ff., LIX, pp. 596 ff. There are also some instances of the use of the genitive in Thessalian and Boeotian which Solmsen, *loc. cit.*, ascribes to the non-Aeolic, West Greek, element in these dialects, and in the case of Thessalian he thinks that this non-Aeolic type prevailed in the West. But, while for several other phenomena he has clearly established such a distribution, the material is not sufficiently decisive here. The Sotaerus inscription has the genitive, but until there is additional evidence that this represents the normal type in the Thessaliois, it will not be clear that the numerous examples of the patronymic in later inscriptions of Cierium itself, in Pharsalus, etc., are late encroachments from the East.

In Thessalian and Boeotian there are also examples of such adjectives being used in agreement with appellatives, in place of a genitive of possession, as Thess. Πολυξεναία ἐμμί (sc. ἃ στάλλα) Hoffmann II. 42, Boeot. Γοργυνίος ἐμὶ ὁ κότυλος Rolfe *Harvard Studies* II, p. 89, Καλ(λ)αία ἐμὶ (sc. ἃ κύλιξ) τὸ κέντρονος (note the genitive in apposition with that implied by the adjective) Ἐφ. Ἀρχ. 1896, p. 243 (where two other examples are cited),

64. ἀγρέω = αἰρέω. Lesb. ἀγρέθεντες *SGDI*. 214. 33, ἀγρέθεντα *ibid.* 215. 49, ἀγρέσιος *ibid.* 215. 31 (reading not quite certain, but γ probable). καταγρέντον *ibid.* 214. 15, προαγρημένω *ibid.* 311. 6; καταγ[ρέ]θην *ibid.* 213. 13 (where the far less probable καταγ[νώ]θην is given in the text; καταγ[ρέ]θην is preferred in *IG*. XII. ii. 1). Elean ἐξαγρέων *SGDI*. 1156. The Thessalian form is ἀνγρέω with unexplained nasal and spiritus asper (contamination with some other verb ?), seen in ἐφανγρένθην *SGDI*. 345. 41, προανγρέσ[ι] *ibid.* 361 B. 14, ἀνγρέσιος Ἐφ. Αρχ. 1901, p. 134.

All these are precisely equivalent in meaning to the corresponding forms of αἰρέω and its derivatives, except that Thess. ἐφανγρένθην has a force which is not quotable for the rare ἐφαιρέομαι, namely, = ἐπιλαμβάνονται, κατηγοροῦνται (cf. κατηγορεῖν in l. 38). It is this use of the verb as a substitute for the αἰρέω of other dialects, and not the mere form ἀγρέω, that is of significance. This has been very properly emphasized by Schulze *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1897, p. 875, but has been ignored in most discussions. So Gerstenhauer "De Alcaeï et Sapphonis copia vocabulorum" (*Diss. Hal.* XII, pp. 178 ff.) says: "ἀγρεῖν non solum apud Aeolos, sed omnibus in dialectis praeter usitatius αἰρεῖν vetere aetate usurpatum esse iam pridem cognitum est." But of the forms cited by Bergk *Griech. Litteraturgeschichte* I, p. 58, note, and others, most of them glosses, some are clearly derived from ἀγρέω in its original, pregnant, sense of 'catch, seize,' e. g., Boeot. ἀγρεμόνες· θηρευταί (Hesych.), and in some the force of the verb is quite obscure. The force of αἰρέω is beyond question in παλινάγρετος Hom., Hes., etc., ἀντάγρετος Hom., Simon. Am. and ἀνταγρεσίη Callim., but it is quite possible that these poetical forms, as well as the use of ἀγρέω in Archil. 4. 3 and Aesch. *Ag.* 126 (lyric passage), are of Aeolic origin. The meaning 'choose' seems also most appropriate in Lac. ἱππαγρέται, and Coan ἀγρεταί, if properly defined by Hesychius. (For Lac. ἱππαγρέται and some others, Schulze *loc. cit.* assumes ἀγρέω = ἄγω, as in Hom. ἄγρει. But the exclamatory ἄγρει in Homer, though equivalent to ἄγε, need not be separated from ἀγρέω 'catch,' and does not entitle us to assume that the verb was otherwise used in the sense of ἄγω.) It is quite possible that in various dialects ἀγρέω was occasionally used in the sense of αἰρέω. But there is no evidence as yet that it was the regular substitute for it in any other dialects than Lesbian, Thessalian, and Elean.

65. ποδέσσι. I have discussed the distribution of this type of dative in the *Class. Rev.* XIX (1905), pp. 249 ff., and have shown that, while it

is often spoken of as Doric as well as Aeolic, the only occurrences in Doric are from Corinthian colonies. But in place of the suggestion that these might be due to a popular adoption of the epic form, I would now prefer a privately expressed opinion of Solmsen, that they represent an Aeolic element in Corinthian, which the statement of Thuc. iv. 42, *Δωρὴς τὸ παλαιὸν ἰδρυθέντες τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει Κορινθίοις ἐπολέμονι οὔσιν Αἰολεῦσι*, justifies us in assuming.

This is the only one of the Aeolic peculiarities given in the chart which is found in Phocian. For some other possible traces of an Aeolic element in Phocian (*ταγός, δίδημι, κεραίωμα*), see Solmsen *Kühn's Zeitsch.* XXXIV, p. 555, XXXIX, pp. 212, 216.

66-71. These peculiarities are "Aeolic" in the widest sense, that is Aeolic and Achæan (Arcado-Cyprian), some of them appearing also as survivals in certain West Greek dialects.

66. *δέκοτος*=*δέκατος*. This is Arcadian and Lesbian, as confirmed now by *IG.* XII. ii. 82. It is presumably Cyprian also, and possibly Thessalian, but examples are lacking. Arcadian has also *δέκο*(*δυνόδεκο*) and *ἡεκοτόν*, both in Hoffmann I. 29, and Lesbian also *ἐνο[τος]* *IG.* XII. ii. 83. In the note to *IG.* XII. ii. 82 the editor speaks of E standing for *ἕκοτον*. It is probable that this was the Lesbian form, but, so far as I know, it is not quotable. Many class *δέκοτος* with *στρότος*, etc. (below, 70), but as the matter is uncertain, I have preferred to give it a separate place. Aside from the theory of assimilation, which is unsatisfactory, it is possible to regard the *ο* as a further extension of the analogical *ο* which is more widespread in the case of *εἴκοσι* (2).

67. *δν(ὶν)*=*ἀνά*. *δν-* is the usual form in Lesbian, Thessalian (Pelasgiotis; *ἀν-* in the Thessaliotis, as Hoffmann II. 63 from Cierium, *Mon. Antichi.* VIII (1898), p. 66 from Pharsalus), and Cyprian, while *ὶν-* from *δν-* occurs once in Cyprian, and in Arcadian. See 49. Examples of *ἀνά* in these dialects are due to *κοινή* influence. This *δν* is often grouped with cases like *στρότος*, etc. (below, 70), and perhaps correctly.

68. *ἀπύ*=*ἀπό*. See 49.

69. *φίλημι*. The unthematic inflection of the contract verbs, often known as the Aeolic inflection, is characteristic of Lesbian, Thessalian (Pelasgiotis; but *ἡυλῶρόντος* in the Sotaerus inscription and so perhaps regularly in the Thessaliotis), Arcadian, and Cyprian. For material, to which some additions can now be made, as Arc. *κύνεσαν Ἐφ' Ἀρχ.*, 1898, pp. 248 ff., *ποιέουσι* Kern *Inscr. von Magnesia* 38. 34, see Hoffmann I, pp. 263 ff., II, pp. 574 ff. The supposed Boeotian forms of this type quoted from grammarians by Meister I, pp. 276 ff., find no support in the inscriptions, which show the usual type (*στραταγίοντος*, etc.). *φίλειμι, ποίειμι*, etc., are simply Lesbian forms put into Boeotian spelling and are no more genuine than *ἴσταιμι*. The "Aeolic" *οἴκεντι, φιλεντι*, while they cannot be Lesbian, need not therefore be Boeotian. They may be Thessalian.

τελεσφορέντες in an inscription of Cyrene *SGDI*. 4837, represents a direct importation from Arcadia according to Blass *SGDI*. III, p. 195, who supposes that the Peloponnesian colonists, who with the Cretans constituted the second phyle established by Demonax (Herod. iv. 161), consisted largely of Arcadians. But it is at least equally probable that the type was brought to Cyrene by the original colonists from Thera, and is to be added to the other evidences of a pre-Doric (Achaean) element in Thera. The fact that no such forms are quotable from Thera itself is not a serious objection to this view, in the meager state of the material.

In Elean, which otherwise has the usual thematic inflection (ποιέον, ποιόι, etc.) occur also συλαίῃ, and, in the amnesty-decree, Solmsen *Insc. select.* 40, δαμοσιόια (= -οιη) and δαμοσιῶμεν. The two optatives may be viewed in the same light as Attic-Ionic μισθοίην, etc. (Brugmann *Gr. Gram.*<sup>3</sup>, pp. 339 f.), and so do not necessarily imply the existence of the more general unthematic type. The infinitive in -όμεν, which is seen also in Cret. [δ]αμῶμεν, ζαμῶμεν *SGDI*. 4985, 5125, perhaps also represents a restricted extension of unthematic forms, the limits of which are not yet clear.

70. στροτός=στρατός. This stands for the whole series of forms in which ρο or ορ, λο or ολ, appear in place of usual ρα, αρ, λα, αλ. The most numerous examples are in Lesbian, for which see Hoffmann II, pp. 355 ff. There are also some few Homeric forms which belong here, as ἡμβροτον=ἡμαρτον (Lesb. ἀμβρ[ό]την Hoffmann II. 82 is surely =ἀμαρτεῖν), probably ἄορ, ἄορτήρ (see Solmsen *Untersuchungen zu griech. Laut- und Verslehre*, p. 292).<sup>1</sup> στροτός is attested for Boeotian by στροτιώτης, ἐστροτειάθη, and numerous proper names (see Index to *IG*. VII); στραταγίοντος and names containing στρατός, while conceivably the West Greek forms, are best attributed to κοινή influence. πόρνοψ=πάρνοψ is quoted as Boeotian by Strabo xiii. 613. ἐροτός=ἐρατός and βροχός=βραχός are attested by proper names in both Boeotian and Thessalian. See Sadée *De Boeot. tit. dial.*, pp. 10 f. πορνάμεν· πωλεῖν from Hesychius is claimed as Thessalian by Schulze *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1897, p. 873, but I see no reason why it may not equally well be Boeotian or taken from some literary Aeolic source (with -μεν, as in Homer, beside -μεναι). In Arcadian we have ἐφθορκός=ἐφθαρκός, and πανάγορσις=πανήγυρις, with which compare West Ion., ἀγαρρις *IG*. XIV. 759 (Naples). Cyprian κατέφοργον is probably \*κατέφαργον, aorist of \*κατ-εφέρω (κατείρω). Hesychius cites κορζία=καρδία and στροπά=ἀστραπή as Cyprian (also στορπά as Arcadian).

Some similar forms occur also in West Greek dialects, especially derivatives of γράφω. Thus γροφεύς in Elis (beside γράφος), Argolis (Argos, Mycenae, Epidaurus), and in Sicily (Kern *Inscr. von Magnesia*, p. 41);

<sup>1</sup> Here belongs βροτός for \*βρατός (cf. Skt. *mṛtá-*). As a purely poetical word it has survived only in its Homeric, that is, in this case Aeolic, form. μορτός (Hesych., Callim.) is probably also Aeolic.

in Argolis also γροφίς, γροφείω, ἀγγροφά, ἐγγροφά, σύγγροφος (see especially *IG.* IV. 1484, 1485 from Epidaurus) but γράσση = γράμμα; Heracl. ἀνεπί-γροφος; Cret. ἀπόγροφον, ἐγγροφον; Mel. Γρόφων (so, not γρόφων, in *SGDI* 4871, no less than in 4872; see following). But we find only γραφ- in verb-forms, even in the same inscriptions which contain nouns in γροφ-. Cf. also Cret., Epid. καταλοβείς 'support' = \*καταλαβείς, and Cret. ἀβλοπία = ἀβλαβία (cf. Hesychius ἀβλοπές· ἀβλαβές, Κρήτες).

The uncertainty as to the real history of forms like στροτός (see Brugmann *Gr. Gram.*<sup>3</sup>, p. 68 with literature cited) makes it difficult to decide whether all the examples cited are of equal significance. Many of them, considered by themselves, might easily be regarded as inherited o-grade forms. But it is obvious that where the examples are so numerous as in Lesbian some special phonetic development must be involved, though the more precise conditions are still obscure. And I am fully satisfied that not only the Boeotian and Thessalian, but also the Arcadian and Cyprian examples, are to be viewed in the same light. In the case of γροφεύς, etc., there is more ground for the suspicion of having to do merely with an inherited o-grade, partly because of their provenance, partly because of the restriction to derivatives. Nevertheless I am inclined to believe that the resemblance of these forms to those in Lesbian, etc., is not accidental, and to reckon them among the pre-Doric survivals in West Greek.

It is still more difficult to estimate the significance of certain other forms which show o in place of usual a. Thus, besides Lesb., Arc. δέκοτος, Arc. ηεκοτόν, etc., and Lesb., Thess., Arc., Cyp., ὄν=ἀνά, which have been mentioned above (66, 67), we find Heracl. τοφιῶν 'grave,' Delph. ἐντοφήμα 'burial rites' (cf. τάφος), and κοθαρός=καθαρός in Heracl., Sybaris, Locr. (Περφοθαριᾶν), κόθαρσις in Elean.

71. πεδά=μετά. This is Lesbian, Boeotian, Arcadian (presumably also Thessalian and Cyprian, but not yet quotable), Argive, Cretan, and Theran. In all these it is clearly the genuine form of the dialect, being displaced by μετά only in later times under κοινή influence. Πεδαγείνιος or Πεταγείνιος = Att. Μεταγείνιος is also Megarian, Rhodian, Coan, and Calymnian, which have only μετά used alone, though all examples are late enough to be κοινή. For full material see Miss Kellermann *Syntax of Some Prepositions in the Greek Dialects*, pp. 56 ff., supplementing the Argive examples by πεδ' ἰαρόν, πεδάγαγον, *BCH.* XXVII (1903), pp. 270 ff.

The distribution of πεδά and μετά, forms of totally distinct origin, may, of course, be accidental, but is such as to make probable at least the view, long since urged by Hoffmann *De mixtis Graec. ling. dial.*, p. 8, that the preference for πεδά was an Aeolic-Achaean characteristic, and s to be regarded as a pre-Doric survival in Argos, Crete, etc.